arXiv:0807.4982v1 [math.AP] 31 Jul 2008

Analytic Wave Front Set for Solutions to Schrödinger Equations II – Long Range Perturbations

André Martinez[1], Shu Nakamura[2], Vania Sordoni[1]

July 31, 2008

Abstract

This paper is a continuation of [MNS2], where short range perturbations of the flat Euclidian metric where considered. Here, we generalize the results of [MNS2] to long-range perturbations (in particular, we can allow potentials growing like $\langle x\rangle^{2-\varepsilon}$ at infinity). More precisely, we construct a modified quantum free evolution $G_0(-s, hD_z)$ acting on Sjöstrand's spaces, and we characterize the analytic wave front set of the solution $e^{-itH}u_0$ of the Schrödinger equation, in terms of the semiclassical exponential decay of $G_0(-th^{-1}, hD_z)\mathbf{T}u_0$, where $\mathbf{T}$ stands for the Bargmann-transform. The result is valid for $t < 0$ near the forward non trapping points, and for $t > 0$ near the backward non trapping points. It is an extension of [Na3] to the analytic framework.

1 Introduction

We consider the analytic singularities of the solutions $u(t) = e^{-itH}u_0$ to a variable coefficients Schrödinger equation, where the Schrödigner operator H is time-independent and of long-range type perturbation (that is, subquadratic) of the Laplacian H_0 on $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Such a problem has been the source of an abundant literature in the last decades, and we refer to [MNS1, MNS2] for a long (though probably not exhaustive) list of references. Let us only mention the most recent works [Do1, Do2, HaWu, It, KaTa, MNS1, MNS2, MRZ, Na1, Na2, Na3, RoZu1, RoZu2, RoZu3, Wu].

---

[1] Università di Bologna, Dipartimento di Matematica, Piazza di Porta San Donato 5, 40127 Bologna, Italy. Partly supported by Università di Bologna, Funds for Selected Research Topics and Founds for Agreements with Foreign Universities

[2] Graduate School of Mathematical Science, University of Tokyo, 3-8-1 Komaba, Meguro-ku, Tokyo, Japan 153-8914.

In [MNS2], we proved that, in the short range case, the forward (resp. backward) non-trapping microlocal singularities propagate for $t < 0$ (resp. $t > 0$) accordingly with those of the free evolution $e^{-itH_0}u_0$, except for a shift due to the possible perturbation of the metric (no shift appears if the perturbation is of the first order). Actually, this shift is expressed by the underlying classical wave operators for the pair (H, H_0), that is, the map $S_\pm$ defined by

$$S_\pm(x,\xi) := \lim_{t\to\pm\infty} \exp tH_{p_0} \circ \exp tH_{q_0}(x,\xi),$$

where q_0 and p_0 are the principal symbols of H and H_0, respectively. More precisely, denoting by FNT (resp. BNT) the forward (resp. backward) non-trapping set, we proved the two identities (see [MNS2] Theorem 2.1):

$$\begin{aligned} WF_a(e^{-itH}u_0) \cap FNT &= S_+^{-1}(WF_a(e^{-itH_0}u_0)) \text{ for all } t < 0; \\ WF_a(e^{-itH}u_0) \cap BNT &= S_-^{-1}(WF_a(e^{-itH_0}u_0)) \text{ for all } t > 0. \end{aligned}$$

However, in the long range case, the previous operators $S_\pm$ do not exist anymore, and, as well as in the corresponding quantum case, one has to modify the free evolution near infinity in order to define wave operators.

Here, we follow the general idea of [Na3], that consisted in replacing the free quantum evolution by an operator of the form $e^{iW(-t,D_x)}$, where $W = W(t,\xi)$ is a solution to $\partial_t W = p(\partial_\xi W, \xi)$ for large $|\xi|$, and p is the *total* symbol of H.

But in our case, we have the additional difficulty that we must remain in the analytic category, and thus, avoid the use of cut-off functions.

In order to solve this problem, we prefer to work from the very beginning in weighted Sjöstrand's spaces, since this allows us to put ourselves in a semiclassical setting, and to limit the construction of the modified free evolution to the set $\{|\xi| > \delta_0\}$, with $\delta_0 > 0$ arbitrarily small (and actually, we could even have limited it to a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^n\backslash 0$). In this way, we obtain an analytic (h-dependent) function $W(s,\xi;h)$, solution of

$$\partial_s W = h^2 p(\partial_\xi W, h^{-1}\xi),$$

where $h > 0$ is the additional semiclassical parameter, and our result can be written in terms of decaying properties, as $h \to 0_+$, of the quantity $e^{iW(-th^{-1},hD_z)/h}\mathbf{T}u_0$, where $\mathbf{T}$ is the usual Bargmann transform: $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \to H^{loc}_{\Phi_0}$, and the operator $e^{iW(-th^{-1},hD_z)/h}$ acts on the weigthed Sjöstrand space $H^{loc}_{\Phi_0}$ (see Theorem 2.1 for a precise statement).

Let us also observe that we recover one of the difficulties of [MNS2], concerning the fact that the size of the region in which the solution must be considered increases like $\langle s\rangle = \langle th^{-1}\rangle$. In [MNS2], this appeared just after the conjugation by e^{-itH_0}, and constituted the main problem in order to apply Sjöstrand's theory (see [MNS2] Lemma 3.1). Here, this difficulty appears repeatedly when we want to make changes of good contours in the integrals. While this can be done automatically in the microlocal setting of [Sj], here we need to justify it each time we do it, because the size of these contours increases, too, like $\langle s\rangle$.

The paper is organized as follows:

In the next section, we introduce the notations and state our main result. In Section 3, we prove several estimates on the Hamilton flow of the total semiclassical symbol of h^2H. In Section 4, we construct both the classical modified free evolution and the quantum modified free evolution, and we prove that the modified evolution acts correctly on convenient Sjöstrand spaces. In Section 5, we conjugate the evolution equation by the modified free quantum evolution, and we study the structure of the resulting equation. Then, the proof of the main theorem is completed in Section 6. The appendices contain the justification of the various changes of contours of integration (Appendix A) and a technical result concerning the derivations on non-local Sjöstrand's spaces (Appendix B).

2 Notations and result

We consider the Schrödinger equation associated with the operator,

$$H = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j,k=1}^{n} D_j a_{j,k}(x) D_k + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^{n}(a_j(x)D_j + D_j a_j(x)) + a_0(x)$$

on $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, where $D_j = -i\partial_{x_j}$. We suppose the coefficients $\{a_\alpha(x)\}$ satisfy to the following assumptions. For $\nu > 0$ we denote

$$\Gamma_\nu = \big\{ z \in \mathbb{C}^n \bigm| |\mathrm{Im}\, z| < \nu\langle \mathrm{Re}\, z\rangle \big\}.$$

Assumption A. For each α, $a_\alpha(x) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is real-valued and can be extended to a holomorphic function on Γ_ν with some $\nu > 0$. Moreover, for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the matrix $(a_{j,k}(x))_{1\le j,k\le n}$ is symmetric and positive definite, and there exists $\sigma \in (0,1]$ such that,

$$\begin{aligned} &\big|a_{j,k}(x) - \delta_{j,k}\big| \le C_0\langle x\rangle^{-\sigma}, \quad j,k = 1,\dots,n,\\ &\big|a_j(x)\big| \le C_0\langle x\rangle^{1-\sigma}, \qquad\quad j = 1,\dots,n,\\ &\big|a_0(x)\big| \le C_0\langle x\rangle^{2-\sigma}, \end{aligned}$$

for $x \in \Gamma_\nu$ and with some constant $C_0 > 0$.

(Here, we have used the notation $\langle x\rangle := (1+|x|^2)^{1/2}$.) In particular, H is essentially selfadjoint on $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and, denoting by the same letter H its unique selfadjoint extension on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we can consider its quantum evolution group e^{-itH}.

In order to describe the analytic wave-front set of u, we use the setting of [Sj] and introduce the Bargmann-FBI transform $\mathbf{T}$ defined by,

$$\mathbf{T}u(z,h) = \int e^{-(z-y)^2/2h}u(y)dy,$$

where $z\in\mathbb{C}^n$ and $h>0$ is a small extra-parameter. Then, $\mathbf{T}u$ belongs to the Sjöstrand space $H_{\Phi_0}^{loc}$ with $\Phi_0(z) := |\mathrm{Im}\ z|^2/2$, that is, it is a holomorphic function of z, and, for any compact set $K\subset\mathbb{C}^n$ and any $\varepsilon>0$, there exits $C=C(k,\varepsilon)$ such that $|\mathbf{T}u(z,h)|\leq Ce^{(\Phi_0(z)+\varepsilon)/h}$, uniformly for $z\in K$ and $h>0$ small enough.

We recall from [Sj] that a point $(x,\xi)\in T^*\mathbb{R}^n\backslash 0$ is not in $WF_a(u)$ if and only if there exists some $\delta>0$ such that $\mathbf{T}u = \mathcal{O}(e^{(\Phi_0(z)-\delta)/h})$ uniformly for z close enough to $x-i\xi$ and $h>0$ small enough. By using Cauchy-formula and the continuity of Φ_0, it is easy to see that this is also equivalent to the existence of some $\delta'>0$ such that $\|e^{-\Phi_0/h}\mathbf{T}u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = \mathcal{O}(e^{-\delta'/h})$ for some complex neighborhood Ω of $x-i\xi$. In that case, we will just write: $\mathbf{T}u\sim 0$ in $H_{\Phi_0,x-i\xi}$, where $H_{\Phi_0,z}$ is the space of germs of H_{Φ_0}-functions near a complex point z (see [Sj] and the appendix of [MNS2]).

We denote by $p(x,\xi) := \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j,k=1}^n a_{j,k}(x)\xi_j\xi_k$ the principal symbol of H, and by $H_0 := -\frac{1}{2}\Delta$ the free Laplace operator. For any $(x,\xi)\in\mathbb{R}^{2n}$, we also denote by $(y(t,x,\xi),\eta(t,x,\xi)) = \exp tH_p(x,\xi)$ the Hamilton flow of p, and we say that a point $(x_0,\xi_0)\in T^*\mathbb{R}^n\backslash 0$ is forward non-trapping when $|y(t,x_0,\xi_0)|\to\infty$ as $t\to+\infty$. In this case, it is well-known that $\eta(t,x_0,\xi_0)$ admits a limit $\xi_+(x_0,\xi_0)\in\mathbb{R}^n\backslash 0$ as $t\to+\infty$. However, in contrast with the short-range case, the quantity $y(t,x_0,\xi_0)-t\eta(t,x_0,\xi_0)$ may not have a limit.

In order to overcome this inconvenience, one has to modify the free evolution near infinity. For $h>0$ small enough, we set,

$$q(x,\xi;h) := \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j,k=1}^n a_{j,k}(x)\xi_j\xi_k + h\sum_{j=1}^n a_j(x)\xi_j + h^2a_0(x).$$

Then, given some $\delta_0>0$ arbitrarily small, and following [Na3], for $s\geq 0$, $|\xi|>\delta_0$, and $h>0$ small enough, in Section 4.1 we construct a function $W(s,\xi;h)$, solution of,

$$\frac{\partial W}{\partial s} - q(\partial_\xi W,\xi;h) = 0, \tag{2.1}$$

and such that, denoting by $(\tilde{x}(s,z,\zeta;h),\tilde{\xi}(s,z,\zeta;h)) := \exp sH_q(x,\xi)$ the Hamilton flow of q, then, for any forward non-trapping point (x_0,ξ_0) with $|\xi_+(x_0,\xi_0)| > \delta_0$, the quantity,

$$\tilde{x}(h^{-1},x_0,\xi_0;h)-\partial_\xi W(h^{-1},\tilde{\xi}(h^{-1},x_0,\xi_0;h);h)+\partial_\xi W(0,\xi_+(x_0,\xi_0);h) \quad (2.2)$$

admits a limit $x_+(x_0,\xi_0)$ as h tends to 0_+.

For $z \in \mathbb{C}^n \cap \{|\mathrm{Im}\, z| > \delta_0\}$, we set,

$$Z(s,z) := z + \partial_\xi W(0,-\mathrm{Im}\, z) - \partial_\xi W(s,-\mathrm{Im}\, z),$$

and we denote by $W(s,hD_z)$ a quantization of $W(s,\zeta)$ on $H_{\Phi_0,z}$ as in [Sj] (see also [MNS2], Appendix). Then, for any $s \geq 0$, in Section 4.2 we construct an invertible analytic Fourier Integral Operator,

$$G_0(s)\,:\, H_{\Phi_0,Z(s,z)} \to H_{\Phi_0,z}$$

such that,

$$ih\frac{\partial G_0}{\partial s} + (\partial_s W)(s,hD_z)G_0(s) \sim 0 \quad ; \quad G_0(0) \sim I.$$

For more transparency in the notations, we will write $e^{i\widetilde{W}(s,hD_z)/h}$ for the operator $G_0(s)$, where $\widetilde{W}(s,\zeta) := W(s,\zeta) - W(0,\zeta)$.

Then, our main result is,

Theorem 2.1. *Suppose Assumption A, and suppose (x_0,ξ_0) is forward non-trapping with $|\xi_+(x_0,\xi_0)| > \delta_0$. Then, for any $t < 0$ and any $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, one has the equivalence,*

$$(x_0,\xi_0) \notin WF_a(e^{-itH}u_0) \iff e^{i\widetilde{W}(-th^{-1},hD_z)/h}\mathbf{T}u_0 \sim 0 \text{ in } H_{\Phi_0,z_+(x_0,\xi_0)},$$

where $z_+(x_0,\xi_0) := x_+(x_0,\xi_0) - i\xi_+(x_0,\xi_0)$.

Remark 2.2. Since $WF_a(u)$ is conical with respect to ξ and $\xi_+(x_0,\lambda\xi_0) = \lambda\xi_+(x_0,\xi_0)$ for all $\lambda > 0$, the condition $|\xi_+(x_0,\xi_0)| > \delta_0$ is not restrictive.

Remark 2.3. Actually, equation (2.1) needs not be satisfied by W, and the result remains valid with any W such that (2.2) admits a limit, and $\frac{\partial W}{\partial s} - q(\partial_\xi W,\xi;h) = \mathcal{O}(\langle s\rangle^{-1-\sigma})$ uniformly for $s = \mathcal{O}(h^{-1})$, $h \to 0_+$.

Remark 2.4. In the short-range case, one can actually take $W(s,\xi) = s\xi^2/2$, so that $e^{iW(-th^{-1},hD_z)/h}$ just becomes $e^{-itD_z^2/2}$, and the function $e^{iW(-th^{-1},hD_z)/h}\mathbf{T}u_0$ coincides with $\mathbf{T}(e^{-itH_0}u_0)$. Thus, in that case, one recovers the result of [MNS2].

Remark 2.5. Of course, there is a similar result for (x_0,ξ_0) backward non-trapping and $t > 0$.

3 Preliminaries

Replacing u_0 by $e^{itH}u_0$ and changing t to $-t$, we see that the result can be reformulated by writing that, for any $t>0$, one has the equivalence,

$$(x_0,\xi_0)\notin WF_a(u_0) \iff e^{i\widetilde{W}(th^{-1},hD_z)/h}\mathbf{T}(e^{-itH}u_0)\sim 0 \text{ in } H_{\Phi_0,z_+(x_0,\xi_0)}.$$

We set $v(t):=\mathbf{T}(e^{-itH}u_0)$. Then, by a standard result of Sjöstrand's theory (see [Sj] Proposition 7.4 and [MNS2] Section 4), we see that $v(t)$ is solution of,

$$i\frac{\partial v}{\partial t}\sim \tilde{H}v(t) \text{ in } H^{loc}_{\Phi_0}, \tag{3.1}$$

where $\tilde{H}$ is the pseudodifferential operator on $H^{loc}_{\Phi_0}$, defined by,

$$\tilde{H}:=\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}D_{z_j}\mathrm{Op}_R(\tilde{a}_{j,k})D_{z_k}+\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^{n}(\mathrm{Op}_R(\tilde{a}_j)D_{z_j}+D_{z_j}\mathrm{Op}_R(\tilde{a}_j))+\mathrm{Op}_R(\tilde{a}_0). \tag{3.2}$$

Here, we have set $\tilde{a}_{j,k}(z,\zeta):=a_{j,k}(z+i\zeta)$, $\tilde{a}_j(z,\zeta):=a_j(z+i\zeta)$, and, for any function $a(z.\zeta)$ holomorphic near some point $(z_0,-\mathrm{Im}\, z_0)$, we have denoted by $\mathrm{Op}_R(a)$ its quantization on H_{Φ_0,z_0} given by,

$$\mathrm{Op}_R(a)v(z;h):=\frac{1}{(2\pi h)^n}\int_{\gamma_R(z)}e^{i(z-y)\zeta/h}a\big(\frac{y+z}{2},\zeta\big)v(y)dyd\zeta, \tag{3.3}$$

where $\gamma_R(z)$ is the $2n$-complex contour,

$$\gamma_R(z)\ :\ \zeta=-\mathrm{Im}\, z+iR(\overline{z-y})\ ;\ |z-y|<R^{-1/2}, \tag{3.4}$$

with $R>0$ constant, R sufficiently (and arbitrarily) large.

As in [MNS2], we change the time scale by setting $s:=t/h$, and we multiply equation (3.1) by h^2. We obtain (with the notation $\tilde{v}(s):=v(hs)$),

$$ih\frac{\partial\tilde{v}}{\partial s}\sim\widetilde{Q}\tilde{v}(s) \text{ in } H^{loc}_{\Phi_0}, \tag{3.5}$$

with $\widetilde{Q}:=h^2\tilde{H}=\widetilde{Q}_0+h\widetilde{Q}_1+h^2\widetilde{Q}_2$, where the symbol of $\widetilde{Q}_j$ is of the form $\widetilde{q}_j+\mathcal{O}(h)$ (locally in (z,ζ)), with,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\widetilde{q}_0(z,\zeta;h)=q_0(z+i\zeta,\zeta):=\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}a_{j,k}(z+i\zeta)\zeta_j\zeta_k;\\
&\widetilde{q}_1(z,\zeta;h)=q_1(z+i\zeta,\zeta):=\sum_{j=1}^{n}a_j(z+i\zeta)\zeta_j;\\
&\widetilde{q}_2(z,\zeta;h)=q_2(z+i\zeta,\zeta):=a_0(z+i\zeta).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

In order to construct the function $W(s,\xi)$ and the Fourier integral operator $G_0(s) \sim e^{i\widetilde{W}(s,hD_z)/h}$, we need some estimates on the Hamilton flow of $q := q_0 + hq_1 + h^2q_2$.

Lemma 3.1. *Set* $(\tilde{x}(s,x,\xi;h),\tilde{\xi}(s,x,\xi;h)) := \exp sH_q(x,\xi)$*. Then, for any forward non-trapping point* (x_0,ξ_0) *and any* $T>0$, $\tilde{\xi}(T/h,x_0,\xi_0;h)$ *tends to* $\xi_+(x_0,\xi_0)$ *(independent of* T*) as* $h\to 0_+$*. Moreover, there exists a constant* $C=C(T)>0$ *such that, for* $(x,\xi)\in\mathbb{C}^{2n}$ *close enough to* (x_0,ξ_0), $s\in[0,T/h]$*, and* $h>0$ *small enough, one has,*

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\tilde{x}(s,x,\xi;h)| \geq \frac{s}{C} - C;\\
&|\tilde{\xi}(s,x,\xi;h) - \xi_+(x,\xi)| \leq C\langle s\rangle^{-\sigma};\\
&|\tilde{x}(s,x,\xi;h)| \leq Cs + C.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. This proof is rather standard, and we just sketch it (see, e.g., [Na3] for more details). At first, we observe that Assumtion A implies that the flow exists for all $s\geq 0$ if the starting point is close enough to the real, and (omitting the dependence with respect to x,ξ,h in the notations), we compute,

$$\frac{d^2}{ds^2}|\tilde{x}(s)|^2 = 2|\tilde{\xi}(s)|^2 + U(\tilde{x}(s),\tilde{\xi}(s)), \tag{3.7}$$

with,

$$U(x,\xi) = \mathcal{O}(\langle x\rangle^{-\sigma}|\xi|^2 + h\langle x\rangle^{1-\sigma}|\xi| + h^2\langle x\rangle^{2-\sigma})$$

uniformly. Now, by the conservation of energy and Assumption A, we see that $|\tilde{\xi}(s)| + |\tilde{\xi}(s)|^{-1}$ remains uniformly bounded, while $\tilde{x}(s) = \mathcal{O}(\langle s\rangle)$ uniformly. Therefore, for $s\in[0,T/h]$, we deduce from (3.7) and Assumption A,

$$\frac{d^2}{ds^2}|\tilde{x}(s)|^2 \geq C^{-1} - Ch^{\sigma} - C\langle\tilde{x}(s)\rangle^{-\sigma}, \tag{3.8}$$

for some constant $C>0$ and $(x,\xi)\in\mathbb{C}^{2n}$ close enough to (x_0,ξ_0). Since (x_0,ξ_0) is forward non trapping, there necessarily exists $s_0>0$ such that $\langle\tilde{x}(s_0)\rangle^{\sigma} > 3C^2$ and $\partial_s|\tilde{x}(s_0)|>0$ (it is true at $(x,\xi)=(x_0,\xi_0)$, and thus also in a complex neighborhood of this point by continuity of the flow). Then, by (3.8), and for h small enough, we deduce that $|\tilde{x}(s)|^2$ is a convex function of s in $[s_0,T/h]$, and that $|\tilde{x}(s)|^2 \geq (s-s_0)^2/2C$ for all $s\in[s_0,T/h]$.

The same arguments apply to the flow $(y(s),\eta(s)) := \exp tH_{q_0}(x,\xi)$ of the principal symbol q_0 (independent of h) of H, and then we can compare $(\tilde{x}(s),\tilde{\xi}(s))$ with $(y(s),\eta(s))$. A direct computation, as in the proof of [Na3] Proposition 2.9, leads to,

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\partial_s(\tilde{x}-y)| \leq C(|\tilde{\xi}-\eta| + \langle s\rangle^{-1-\sigma}|\tilde{x}-y| + h\langle s\rangle^{1-\sigma});\\
&|\partial_s(\tilde{\xi}-\eta)| \leq C(\langle s\rangle^{-1-\sigma}|\tilde{\xi}-\eta| + \langle s\rangle^{-2-\sigma}|\tilde{x}-y| + h\langle s\rangle^{-\sigma} + h^2\langle s\rangle^{1-\sigma}).
\end{aligned}$$

For $s \in [0, T/h]$, we set $g(s) = C \int_s^{+\infty} \langle s' \rangle^{-1-\sigma} ds'$ and $(\alpha, \beta) := e^g(|\tilde{x} - y|, |\tilde{\xi} - \eta|)$. For almost all $s \in [0, T/h]$, we obtain,

$$\partial_s \alpha \le C(\beta + h\langle s \rangle^{1-\sigma}); \tag{3.9}$$

$$\partial_s \beta \le C(\langle s \rangle^{-2-\sigma}\alpha + h\langle s \rangle^{-\sigma}). \tag{3.10}$$

Setting

$$\begin{aligned} Y &:= \int_0^s \langle s' \rangle^{-1-\sigma/2} (\partial_s \alpha)(s') ds' + \beta \\ &= \langle s \rangle^{-1-\sigma/2}\alpha + \beta + (1 + \sigma/2) \int_0^s \langle s' \rangle^{-2-\sigma/2} \frac{s'}{\langle s' \rangle} \alpha(s') ds', \end{aligned}$$

we find,

$$\partial_s Y \le C\langle s \rangle^{-1-\sigma/2} Y + 2Ch\langle s \rangle^{-\sigma} \quad \text{a.e.},$$

and thus, since $Y(0) = 0$,

$$Y(s) = \mathcal{O}(h\langle s \rangle^{1-\sigma}).$$

In particular, this gives $\tilde{\xi}(s) = \eta(s) + \mathcal{O}(h\langle s \rangle^{1-\sigma})$, and thus $\tilde{\xi}(T/h) = \eta(T/h) + \mathcal{O}(h^\sigma) \to \xi_+(x, \xi)$ as $h \to 0_+$. Moreover, since $|\eta(s) - \xi_+(x, \xi)| = \mathcal{O}(\langle s \rangle^{-\sigma})$, we also have $|\tilde{\xi}(s) - \xi_+(x, \xi)| = \mathcal{O}(h\langle s \rangle^{1-\sigma} + \langle s \rangle^{-\sigma}) = \mathcal{O}(\langle s \rangle^{-\sigma})$. □

Remark 3.2. We also deduce from (3.9) and the estimate on β that $|\tilde{x}(s) - y(s)| = \mathcal{O}(h\langle s \rangle^{2-\sigma}) = \mathcal{O}(h^\sigma \langle s \rangle)$.

4 Construction of the modified free evolution

4.1 The modified free classical evolution

We first show,

Lemma 4.1. *For any $\delta > 0$, there exists $R_\delta > 0$, such that, for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $|\xi| \ge \delta$, the point $X_\delta(\xi) := (R_\delta \xi / |\xi|, \xi)$ is forward non trapping. Moreover, for any $s \ge 0$ and $h > 0$ small enough, the application,*

$$J_{s,\delta} \, : \, \xi \mapsto \tilde{\xi}(s, X_\delta(\xi); h)$$

is a diffeomorphism from $\{|\xi| > \delta\}$ to its image, and there exists $\delta' = \delta'(\delta) \to 0_+$ as $\delta \to 0_+$ such that,

$$J_{s,\delta}(|\xi| > \delta) \supset \{|\xi| > \delta'\}. \tag{4.1}$$

Proof. The existence of R_δ such that $X_\delta(\xi)$ is non trapping is very standard, and comes form the fact that the point $X_\delta(\xi)$ is in the out-going region (because $R_\delta \xi / |\xi| \cdot \xi = R_\delta |\xi| = \left| R_\delta \xi / |\xi| \right| \cdot |\xi|$), and that the norm of its position is $R_\delta >> 1$ (see, e.g., [Na3]). Then, arguments similar to (but simpler than) those used in the proof of Lemma 3.1 show that one has,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|d_\xi\tilde{\xi}(s, X_\delta(\xi); h) - I\right| = \mathcal{O}(R_\delta^{-\sigma});\\
&\left|\tilde{\xi}(s, X_\delta(\xi); h) - \xi\right| = \mathcal{O}(R_\delta^{-\sigma}|\xi|),
\end{aligned}$$

uniformly with respect to s, ξ, R_δ and h. Therefore, if R_δ is large enough, we see that $J_{s,\delta}$ is a diffeomorphism from $\{|\xi| > \delta\}$ to its image, and that this one contains $\{|\xi| > (1 + CR_\delta^{-\sigma})\delta\}$ for some constant $C > 0$ independent of δ. Thus the result follows. $\square$

Now, we fix $\delta_0 > 0$ arbitrarily small, and , for $s \geq 0$ and $|\xi| \geq \delta_0$, we set,

$$\hat{x}(s, \xi) := \tilde{x}(s, R_\delta\xi/|\xi|, J_{s,\delta}^{-1}(\xi)),$$

where $\delta > 0$ is sufficiently small in order to have (4.1) with $\delta' = \delta_0$. Then, we define,

$$W(s, \xi) := R_\delta|\xi| + \int_0^s q(\hat{x}(s', \xi), \xi)ds'. \tag{4.2}$$

By standard Hamilton-Jacobi theory (see, e.g., [ReSi, Ro, Na3]), we know that W solves the equation,

$$\frac{\partial W}{\partial s} = q(\partial_\xi W, \xi; h), \tag{4.3}$$

and that one has,

$$\partial_\xi W(s, \xi) = \hat{x}(s, \xi). \tag{4.4}$$

(Indeed, one easily verifies that $\hat{x}(s, \xi)$ is solution of the equation $\partial_s\hat{x}(s, \xi) = {}^t\partial_\xi\hat{x}\,\partial_x q(\hat{x}, \xi) + \partial_\xi q(\hat{x}, \xi)$, with $\hat{x}(0, \xi) = \partial_\xi(R_\delta|\xi|)$, so that (4.4) follows by differentiating (4.2) in ξ, and (4.3) as well by derivating (4.2) in s.)
Moreover, W is analytic on $\{|\xi| > \delta_0\}$, it is real if ξ is real, and we have,

Lemma 4.2. *Let $(x, \xi) \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ be forward non trapping with $|\xi_+(x, \xi)| > \delta_0$. Then, there exists $x_+(x, \xi) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that, for any $T > 0$, the quantity,*

$$\tilde{x}(T/h, x, \xi; h) - \partial_\xi\widetilde{W}(T/h, \tilde{\xi}(T/h, x, \xi); h)$$

tends to $x_+(x, \xi)$ as $h \to 0_+$.

Proof. The proof is identical to that of [Na3], Proposition 2.12, and we omit it. $\square$

4.2 The modified free quantum evolution

For any $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}^n$ with $|\mathrm{Im}\ z_0| > \delta_0$, the holomorphic function $\zeta \mapsto W(s, \zeta; h)$ (defined in a complex neighborhood of $-\mathrm{Im}\ z$) can be quantized into an analytic pseudodifferential operator $W(s, hD_z)$ acting on H_{Φ_0,z_0}, by the formula,

$$W(s, hD_z)v(z) := \frac{1}{(2\pi h)^n} \int_{\gamma(z)} e^{i(z-y)\zeta/h} W(s, \zeta)v(y)dyd\zeta,$$

where $\gamma(z)$ is the $2n$-complex contour,

$$\gamma(z) \,:\, \zeta = -\mathrm{Im}\ z + iR(\overline{z-y}) \ ;\ |z-y| < r,$$

with $r > 0$ constant, sufficiently (and arbitrarily) small and $R \geq 1$ arbitrarilly large.

The purpose of this section is to construct a Fourier integral operator, $G_0(s)$ between some Sjöstrand's space $H_{\Phi_0,Z_s(z_0)}$ and H_{Φ_0,z_0}, such that $Z_0(z_0) = z_0$, and,

$$ih\frac{\partial G_0}{\partial s} + (\partial_s W)(s, hD_z)G_0(s) \sim 0 \quad ; \quad G_0(0) \sim I,$$

uniformly for $s \in [0, T/h]$ ($T > 0$ arbitrary). Since $-\partial_s W = -\partial_s W(s, \zeta)$ does not depend on z, its classical flow is easily determined as,

$$U_s \,:\, (z, \zeta) \mapsto (z - \partial_\zeta \widetilde{W}(s, \zeta), \zeta),$$

where we have set $\widetilde{W}(s, z) := W(s, \eta) - W(0, \eta)$. Therefore, in order to obtain z_0 as for the final base-point, the initial base-point should be,

$$Z_s(z_0) := z_0 + \partial_\zeta \widetilde{W}(s, -\mathrm{Im}\ z_0). \tag{4.5}$$

Moreover, we see that $G_0(s)$ can be taken of the form,

$$G_0(s)v(z; h) = \frac{1}{(2\pi h)^n} \int_{\gamma(s,z)} e^{i(z-y)\eta/h + i\widetilde{W}(s,\eta)/h} v(y)dyd\eta, \tag{4.6}$$

where it only remains to determine the contour $\gamma(s, z)$. We have,

Lemma 4.3. *For any* $z \in \mathbb{C}^n \cap \{|\mathrm{Im}\ z| > \delta_0\}$ *and* $s \geq 0$*, the application*

$$\Psi_{s,z} : (y, \eta) \mapsto \Phi_0(y) - \mathrm{Im}\ ((z-y)\eta + \widetilde{W}(s, \eta))$$

admits a saddle point at $U_s^{-1}(z, -\mathrm{Im}\ z)$ *with critical value* $\Phi_0(z)$.

Proof. We compute,

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla_y \Big(\Phi_0(y) - \mathrm{Im}\,((z-y)\eta + \widetilde{W}(s,\eta))\Big) &= -\frac{i}{2}(\mathrm{Im}\,y + \eta);\\
\nabla_\eta \Big(\Phi_0(y) - \mathrm{Im}\,((z-y)\eta + \widetilde{W}(s,\eta))\Big) &= \frac{i}{2}(z - y + \nabla_\eta \widetilde{W}(s,\eta)),
\end{aligned}$$

so that any critical point must verify $\eta = -\mathrm{Im}\,y$ and $y = z + \nabla_\eta \widetilde{W}(s,\eta)$. In particular, since η is real, one must have $\mathrm{Im}\,y = \mathrm{Im}\,z$, and therefore,

$$\eta = -\mathrm{Im}\,z \quad ; \quad y = z + \nabla_\eta \widetilde{W}(s, -\mathrm{Im}\,z),$$

that is, $(y,\eta) = U_s^{-1}(z, -\mathrm{Im}\,z)$. Conversely, we see that $U_s(z, -\mathrm{Im}\,z)$ is a critical point of $\Phi_0(y) - \mathrm{Im}\,((z-y)\eta + \widetilde{W}(s,\eta))$. Moreover, since W is real on the real, we have $\mathrm{Im}\,\nabla_\eta^2 \widetilde{W}(s,\eta) = 0$ for $\eta = -\mathrm{Im}\,z$, and one easily deduces that the critical point is non degenerate for all $s \geq 0$. Since, for $s = 0$, it is a saddle point, by continuity it remains a saddle point for all $s \geq 0$, and the critical value is $\Phi_0(z + \nabla_\eta \widetilde{W}(s, -\mathrm{Im}\,z)) = \Phi_0(z)$.

□

Thus, we could take for $\gamma(s,z)$ any good $2n$-contour for the map $(y,\eta) \mapsto \Phi_0(y) - \mathrm{Im}\,((z-y)\eta + \widetilde{W}(s,\eta))$, that is, any contour of real dimension $2n$, containing $U_s(z, -\mathrm{Im}\,z)$, and along which,

$$\Psi_{s,z}(y,\eta) - \Phi_0(z) \leq -\delta |(y,\eta) - U_s(z, -\mathrm{Im}\,z)|^2,$$

for some $\delta > 0$. However, δ may depend on s, and this is not enough to properly define the operator $G_0(s)$ when s becomes large.

Setting $A_s(z) := \mathrm{Hess}_\xi W(s, -\mathrm{Im}\,z)$, for $s \geq 0$ we instead consider the contour $\gamma(s,z)$ defined by,

$$\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\mathrm{Re}\,\eta = -\mathrm{Im}\,y;\\
\mathrm{Im}\,\eta = \langle s\rangle^{-2}\big[\mathrm{Re}\,(z-y) + \partial_\zeta \widetilde{W}(s, -\mathrm{Im}\,z) + A_s(z)\mathrm{Im}\,(z-y)\big];\\
\langle s\rangle^{-1}|\mathrm{Re}\,(z-y) + \partial_\zeta \widetilde{W}(s, -\mathrm{Im}\,z)| + |\mathrm{Im}\,(z-y)| \leq r,
\end{array}\right. \tag{4.7}$$

where $r > 0$ is an arbitrarily small constant. Then, we claim,

Lemma 4.4. *If r is chosen sufficiently small, then there exists a constant $\delta > 0$ independent of s, such that, along $\gamma(s,z)$, one has,*

$$\Psi_{s,z}(y,\eta) - \Phi_0(z) \leq -\delta\big[\langle s\rangle^{-2}|\mathrm{Re}\,(z-y) + \partial_\xi \widetilde{W}(s, -\mathrm{Im}\,z)|^2 + |\mathrm{Im}\,(z-y)|^2\big].$$

Remark 4.5. In particular, on the boundary of $\gamma(s,z)$ we obtain $\Psi_{s,z}(y,\eta) - \Phi_0(z) \leq -r_1$ with $r_1 > 0$ independent of s. In that case, we will say that $\gamma(s,z)$ is a good contour for the phase $\Psi_{s,z}$ uniformly with respect to s.

Proof. At first, let us observe that, by Lemma 3.1 and (4.4), for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n$, we have,

$$\partial_\xi^\alpha W(s,\xi) = \mathcal{O}(\langle s\rangle) \tag{4.8}$$

uniformly for $s = \mathcal{O}(1/h)$.

We set,

$$\begin{aligned} a &:= y - z - \nabla_\eta \widetilde{W}(s, -\mathrm{Im}\ z);\\ \alpha &:= \eta + \mathrm{Im}\ z. \end{aligned}$$

Since $W(s,\eta)$ is real on the real, performing a Taylor expansion and using (4.8), we see that,

$$\mathrm{Im}\ (\widetilde{W}(s,\eta) - \alpha\cdot\nabla_\eta\widetilde{W}(s,-\mathrm{Im}\ z)) = A_s(z)\mathrm{Re}\ \alpha\cdot\mathrm{Im}\ \alpha + \mathcal{O}(\langle s\rangle|\mathrm{Im}\ \alpha|\,|\alpha|^2).$$

Then, by a straightforward computation, we find,

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{s,z}(y,\eta) = \frac{1}{2}|\mathrm{Im}\ a|^2 + \mathrm{Im}\ a\cdot\mathrm{Re}\ \alpha + \mathrm{Re}\ a\cdot\mathrm{Im}\ \alpha - A_s(z)\mathrm{Re}\ \alpha\cdot\mathrm{Im}\ \alpha&\\ +\mathcal{O}(\langle s\rangle|\mathrm{Im}\ \alpha|\,|\alpha|^2).& \end{aligned}$$

Now, by definition, along $\gamma(s,z)$, we have,

$$\begin{cases} \mathrm{Re}\ \alpha = -\mathrm{Im}\ a;\\ \mathrm{Im}\ \alpha = -\langle s\rangle^{-2}\big(\mathrm{Re}\ a + A_s(z)\mathrm{Im}\ a\big);\\ \langle s\rangle^{-1}|\mathrm{Re}\ a| + |\mathrm{Im}\ a| \le r, \end{cases}$$

and thus, there we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{s,z}(y,\eta) = -\frac{1}{2}|\mathrm{Im}\ a|^2 - \langle s\rangle^{-2}\big|\mathrm{Re}\ a + A_s(z)\mathrm{Im}\ a\big|^2&\\ +\mathcal{O}(\langle s\rangle^{-1}\big|\mathrm{Re}\ a + A_s(z)\mathrm{Im}\ a\big|\,|\mathrm{Im}\ a|^2)&\\ +\mathcal{O}(\langle s\rangle^{-5}\big|\mathrm{Re}\ a + A_s(z)\mathrm{Im}\ a\big|^3).& \end{aligned}$$

Using again (4.8), this in particular gives,

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{s,z}(y,\eta) \le -\frac{1}{2}|\mathrm{Im}\ a|^2 - \langle s\rangle^{-2}\big|\mathrm{Re}\ a + A_s(z)\mathrm{Im}\ a\big|^2&\\ +C\big(\langle s\rangle^{-1}|\mathrm{Re}\ a| + |\mathrm{Im}\ a|\big)\big(|\mathrm{Im}\ a|^2 + \langle s\rangle^{-2}\big|\mathrm{Re}\ a + A_s(z)\mathrm{Im}\ a\big|^2\big),& \end{aligned}$$

where $C > 0$ is a uniform constant. Hence,

$$\Psi_{s,z}(y,\eta) \le -(\frac{1}{2} - Cr)|\mathrm{Im}\ a|^2 - (1 - Cr)\langle s\rangle^{-2}\big|\mathrm{Re}\ a + A_s(z)\mathrm{Im}\ a\big|^2,$$

and the result follows by taking $r < 1/(2C)$ and by observing that

$$|\mathrm{Im}\ a|^2 + \langle s\rangle^{-2}\big|\mathrm{Re}\ a + A_s(z)\mathrm{Im}\ a\big|^2 \ge \delta(|\mathrm{Im}\ a|^2 + \langle s\rangle^{-2}|\mathrm{Re}\ a|^2)$$

if $\delta > 0$ is small enough, independently of s. □

Taking the contour $\gamma(s,z)$ as in (4.7), and defining $G_0(s)$ by (4.6) and $Z_s(z_0)$ by (4.5), we have,

Proposition 4.6. *For $\varepsilon, s > 0$ and $Z \in \mathbb{C}^n$, we set,*

$$\Omega_s(Z,\varepsilon) := \{z \in \mathbb{C}^n \,;\, \langle s\rangle^{-1}|\mathrm{Re}\,(z-Z)| + |\mathrm{Im}\,(z-Z)| < \varepsilon\}.$$

Then, for any $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}^n \cap \{|\mathrm{Im}\, z| > \delta_0\}$ and $\varepsilon_1 > r$, there exists $\varepsilon_2 > 0$ such that, for any $s \geq 0$, the operator $G_0(s)$ maps $H_{\Phi_0}(\Omega_s(Z_s(z_0),\varepsilon_1))$ into $H_{\Phi_0}(\Omega_s(z_0,\varepsilon_2))$. Moreover, $G_0(s)$ verifies $G_0(0) \sim I$ and,

$$ih\frac{\partial G_0}{\partial s} + (\partial_s W)(s, hD_z)G_0(s) \sim 0,$$

uniformly for $s \in [0, T/h]$ ($T > 0$ arbitrary), in the sense that (possibly by shrinking ε_2) there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that, for all $v \in H_{\Phi_0}(\Omega_s(Z_s(z_0),\varepsilon_1))$ and all $s \in [0, T/h]$, one has,

$$\begin{aligned}\Big\| ih\frac{\partial G_0}{\partial s}v + (\partial_s W)(s, hD_z)G_0(s)v\Big\|_{L^2_{\Phi_0}(\Omega_s(z_0,\varepsilon_2))}&\\ \leq Ce^{-1/Ch}\|v\|_{L^2_{\Phi_0}(\Omega_s(Z_s(z_0),\varepsilon_1))}&.\end{aligned}$$

Here, we have used the notation $L^2_{\Phi_0}(\Omega) = L^2(\Omega; e^{-2\Phi_0(z)/h}d\mathrm{Re}\, z d\mathrm{Im}\, z)$.

Proof. Let us recall from [Sj, MNS2] that, if $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ is open, what we call $H_{\Phi_0}(\Omega)$ is the set of h-depending smooth functions on Ω, that can be written on the form $F + f$, where F is holomorpic on Ω and verifies $|F(z;h)| = \mathcal{O}(e^{(\Phi_0(z)+\varepsilon)/h})$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$, while f is such that, for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^{2n}$, there exists $\varepsilon_\alpha > 0$ such that $|\partial^\alpha_{(\mathrm{Re}\, z, \mathrm{Im}\, z)} f(z;h)| = \mathcal{O}(e^{(\Phi_0(z)-\varepsilon_\alpha)/h})$ uniformly for $z \in \Omega$ and $h > 0$ small enough. Moreover, such two functions are identified if their difference satisfies to similar estimates as the previous f, and then we also say that they are equivalent in $H_{\Phi_0}(\Omega)$, or that their difference is neglectible in $H_{\Phi_0}(\Omega)$.

In our case, we have $\Psi_{s,z}(y,\eta) - \Phi_0(z) \leq -\delta r^2/2$ on the boundary of $\gamma(s,z)$. Thus, by Cauchy theorem, for $z \in \Omega_s(z_0,\varepsilon_2)$ and $v \in H_{\Phi_0}(\Omega_s(Z_s(z_0),\varepsilon_1))$, if we substitute $\gamma_0(s) := \gamma(s,z_0)$ to $\gamma(s,z)$ in the expression of $G_0(s)v$, we obtain a function that differs from $G_0(s)v$ by a neglectible function in $H_{\Phi_0}(\Omega_s(z_0),\varepsilon_2))$, where $\varepsilon_2 > 0$ must be sufficiently small in order to have,

$$\sup_{s\geq 0}\ \sup_{z\in\Omega_s(z_+(x_0,\xi_0),\varepsilon_2)}\ \sup_{(y,\eta)\in\partial\gamma_0(s)} (\Psi_{s,z}(y,\eta) - \Phi_0(z)) < 0.$$

This is indeed possible, because on $\partial\gamma_0(s)$, one has,

$$\langle s\rangle^{-1}|\mathrm{Re}\,(y - Z_s)| + |\mathrm{Im}\,(y - Z_s)| = r,$$

and,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Re}\,(Z_s(z_0)-z-\partial_\xi\widetilde{W}(s,-\mathrm{Im}\,z)) &= \mathcal{O}(|\mathrm{Re}\,(z_0-z)|)\\ &\quad +\mathcal{O}(\langle s\rangle|\mathrm{Im}\,(z_0-z)|),\end{aligned}$$

while,

$$\mathrm{Im}\,(Z_s(z_0)-z-\partial_\xi\widetilde{W}(s,-\mathrm{Im}\,z))=\mathcal{O}(|\mathrm{Im}\,(z_0-z)|).$$

On the other hand, the function obtained by substituting $\gamma_0(s)$ to $\gamma(s,z)$ is clearly holomorphic in $\Omega_s(z_0,\varepsilon_2)$, and, by Lemma 4.4, it also verifies the estimates that makes it an element of $H_{\Phi_0}(\Omega_s(z_0,\varepsilon_2))$.

By construction, we also have $G_0(0)\sim I$, in the sense that there exists $C>0$ such that, for all $v\in H_{\Phi_0}(|z-z_0|<\varepsilon_1)$, and possibly by shrinking ε_2, one has,

$$\|G_0(0)v-v\|_{L^2_{\Phi_0}(|z-z_0|<\varepsilon_2)}\le Ce^{-1/Ch}\|v\|_{L^2_{\Phi_0}(|z-z_0|<\varepsilon_1)}.$$

Moreover, by definition we have,

$$\begin{aligned}&(\partial_sW)(s,hD_z)G_0(s)v(z;h)\\ &=\frac{1}{(2\pi h)^{2n}}\int_{\Gamma_0(s,z)}e^{i(z-z')\zeta/h+i(z'-y)\eta/h+i\widetilde{W}(s,\eta)/h}\partial_\zeta W(s,\zeta)\\ &\qquad\qquad\times v(y)dz'd\zeta dyd\eta,\end{aligned}\tag{4.9}$$

where $\Gamma_0(s,z)$ is the $4n$-contour defined by,

$$\Gamma_0(s,z)\,:\,\zeta=-\mathrm{Im}\,z+iR(\overline{z-z'})\quad;\quad|z-z'|\le r\quad;\quad(y,\eta)\in\gamma(s,z'),\tag{4.10}$$

with an arbitrarily small constant $r>0$. It is easy to check that $\Gamma_0(s,z)$ is a good contour for the phase $(z',y,\zeta,\eta)\mapsto\Phi_0(y)-\mathrm{Im}\,((z-z')\zeta+(z'-y)\eta+\widetilde{W}(s,\eta))$ uniformly with respect to s (the critical point is given by $z'=z$, $\zeta=\eta=-\mathrm{Im}\,z$, and $y=z+\nabla_\eta\widetilde{W}(s,-\mathrm{Im}\,z)$).

Another good contour is $\Gamma_1(s,z)$, given by,

$$\Gamma_1(s,z)\,:\,(y,\eta)\in\gamma(s,z)\quad;\quad z'=z-iR^{-1}(\overline{\zeta-\eta})\quad;\quad|\zeta-\eta|<r',\tag{4.11}$$

(with $r'>0$ small enough).

Since the domain of integration is not necessarily a small neighborhood of the critical point, the fact that one can substitute $\Gamma_2(s,z)$ to $\Gamma_1(s,z)$ is not automatic as in general Sjöstrand's theory, but this fact is proved in Appendix (see Lemma A.1). We obtain,

$$\begin{aligned}&(\partial_sW)(s,hD_z)G_0(s)v(z;h)\\ &\qquad=\frac{1}{(2\pi h)^n}\int_{\gamma(s,z)}e^{i(z-y)\eta/h+i\widetilde{W}(s,\eta)/h}W_1(s,z,\eta)v(y)dyd\eta,\end{aligned}$$

where W_1 is given by,

$$W_1(s,\eta)=\frac{1}{(2\pi h)^n}\int_{\substack{z'=iR^{-1}(\overline{\eta-\zeta})\\ |\eta-\zeta|<r'}} e^{iz'(\eta-\zeta)/h}(\partial_s W)(s,\zeta)dz'd\zeta.$$

Then, standard arguments (such as the analytic stationary phase theorem, see [Sj]) show that $W_1(s,\eta)\sim\partial_s W(s,\eta)$ in the space of analytic symbols near $\xi^+(x_0,\xi_0)$.
Let us also observe that, by construction, $(\partial_s W)(s,\zeta)$ is uniformly bounded together with all its derivatives for $s\in[0,T/h]$ and $|\zeta|\geq r_0>0$. As a consequence, the previous equivalence of symbols is indeed uniform with respect to $\in[0,T/h]$.
Therefore, setting,

$$G_0'(s)v(z):=\frac{1}{(2\pi h)^n}\int_{\gamma(s,z)} e^{i(z-y)\eta/h+i\widetilde{W}(s,\eta)/h}(\partial_s W)(s,\eta)v(y)dyd\eta,$$

we deduce the existence, for any given $\varepsilon_1>r$, of $\varepsilon_2>0$ and $C>0$, such that,

$$\begin{aligned}\big\|G_0'(s)v-(\partial_s W)(s,hD_z)G_0(s)v\big\|_{L^2_{\Phi_0}(\Omega_s(z_+(x_0,\xi_0),\varepsilon_2))}&\\ \leq Ce^{-1/Ch}\|v\|_{L^2_{\Phi_0}(\Omega_s(Z_s,\varepsilon_1))}&.\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by differentiating the expression of $G_0(s)$ and using that $\gamma(s,z)$ is a uniformly good contour for the phase $\Psi_{s,z}$, we immediately obtain,

$$ih\frac{\partial G_0}{\partial s}\sim -G_0'(s),$$

and Proposition 4.6 is proved. □

In the same way, one can construct an operator,

$$G_1(s)\,:\,H_{\Phi_0}(\Omega_s(z_0,\varepsilon_1))\rightarrow H_{\Phi_0}(\Omega_s(Z_s(z_0),\varepsilon_2)),$$

(where, as before, $\varepsilon_2>0$ depends on $\varepsilon_1>r$, of the form,

$$G_1(s)v(z)=\frac{1}{(2\pi h)^n}\int_{\gamma'(s,z)} e^{i(z-y)\eta/h-i\widetilde{W}(s,\eta)/h}v(y)dyd\eta \tag{4.12}$$

with $\gamma'(s,z)$ given by,

$$\left\{\begin{array}{l}\mathrm{Re}\,\eta=-\mathrm{Im}\,y;\\ \mathrm{Im}\,\eta=\langle s\rangle^{-2}\big[\mathrm{Re}\,(z-y)+x_1-\partial_\xi W(s,-\mathrm{Im}\,z)-A_s(z)\mathrm{Im}\,(z-y)\big)\big];\\ \langle s\rangle^{-1}|\mathrm{Re}\,(z-y)-x_1+\partial_\xi W(s,-\mathrm{Im}\,z)|+|\mathrm{Im}\,(z-y)|\leq r,\end{array}\right. \tag{4.13}$$

such that $G_1(0) \sim I$ and,

$$ih\frac{\partial G_1}{\partial s} - G_1(s)\,(\partial_s W)(s, hD_z) \sim 0,$$

in a sense analog to that of Proposition 4.6. Then, we also have,

$$\begin{aligned} &G_1(s)G_0(s) \sim I \text{ on } H_{\Phi_0}(\Omega_s(Z_s(z_0), \varepsilon));\\ &G_0(s)G_1(s) \sim I \text{ on } H_{\Phi_0}(\Omega_s(z_0, \varepsilon)),\end{aligned}$$

(where, as before, one actually has to schrink ε in the estimates) and, in the sequel, we rather write $G_0(s)^{-1}$ for $G_1(s)$.

5 The conjugated evolution equation

In order to exploit the results of the previous section, we first show,

Proposition 5.1. *Let $T > 0$, $\tilde{H}$ be the operator defined in (3.2)-(3.3), and $\tilde{Q} = h^2\tilde{H}$. Let also $Z = Z(s) \in \mathbb{C}^n$ be such that* $\mathrm{Im}\, Z(s) \neq 0$ *and* $\langle s\rangle^{-1}|\mathrm{Re}\, Z(s)| + |\mathrm{Im}\, Z(s)| + |\mathrm{Im}\, Z(s)|^{-1} = \mathcal{O}(1)$ *uniformly. Then, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, and by choosing R sufficiently small in the definition of $\tilde{H}$ (that is, in (3.4)), there exists $C > 0$, such that, for any $s \in [0, T/h]$, one has,*

$$\left\| ih\frac{\partial \tilde{v}}{\partial s} - \tilde{Q}\tilde{v}(s)\right\|_{L^2_{\Phi_0}(\Omega_s(Z(s),\varepsilon))} \leq Ce^{-1/Ch}.$$

Proof. We first observe that $\mathbf{T} \circ D_x = D_z \circ \mathbf{T}$. Moreover, since $\mathrm{Im}\, Z(s) = \mathcal{O}(1)$, we have that $\mathrm{Im}\, z$ remains uniformly bounded on $\Omega_s(Z(s), \varepsilon)$. Therefore, using Lemma B.1 in the appendix, we see that hD_z is uniformly bounded from $L^2_{\Phi_0}(\Omega_s(2\varepsilon))$ to $L^2_{\Phi_0}(\Omega_s(\varepsilon))$.
In view of the form of H and $\tilde{H}$, and by bringing all the derivatives to the left, we easily deduce that is enough to prove that, for any $a = a(x)$ holomorphic in Σ_ν and verifying $a(x) = \mathcal{O}(\langle x\rangle^k)$ for some fixed $k \geq 0$, and setting $\tilde{a}(z, \zeta) := a(z + i\zeta)$, one has,

$$\left\| \mathbf{T}(au) - \mathrm{Op}_R(\tilde{a})\mathbf{T}u\right\|_{L^2_{\Phi_0}(\Omega_s(Z(s),\varepsilon))} \leq Ce^{-1/Ch}\|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}, \tag{5.1}$$

with some constant $C > 0$, and for all $s \in [0, T/h]$ and $u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$.
We compute,

$$\mathrm{Op}_R(\tilde{a})\mathbf{T}u(z) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-(z-x)^2/2h} b(x, z; h)u(x)dx, \tag{5.2}$$

with,

$$b(x, z; h) := \frac{1}{(2\pi h)^n}\int_{\gamma_R(z)} e^{(z-y)(i\zeta - x + (y+z)/2)/h} a\big(\frac{z+y}{2} + i\zeta\big) dyd\xi.$$

Now, the contour $\gamma_R(z)$ is not really good for the phase Re $\big((z-y)(i\zeta-x+(y+z)/2)\big)$, because it does not contain the critical point given by $y=z$ and $\zeta=i(z-x)$ (the critical value is 0), unless $x=\text{Re } z$. However, for R sufficiently large, along $\gamma_R(z)$ we have,

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Re } &\big((z-y)(i\zeta-x+(y+z)/2)\big)\\ &\qquad\qquad = -(R+\frac{1}{2})|\text{Re } (z-y)|^2-(R-\frac{1}{2})|\text{Im } (z-y)|^2\\ &\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad -(x-\text{Re } z)\text{Re } (z-y)\\ &\qquad\qquad \leq -\frac{R}{2}|z-y|^2+R^{-1/2}|x-\text{Re } z|. \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

In particular, on the boundary of γ_R, we obtain,

$$\text{Re } \big((z-y)(i\zeta-x+(y+z)/2)\big) \leq -\frac{1}{2}+R^{-1/2}|x-\text{Re } z|.$$

Then, we divide $\Omega_s(Z(s),\varepsilon)$ into,

$$\Omega_s(Z(s),\varepsilon)=\bigcup_{j=1}^{N_s}\Omega_j,$$

where $\Omega_j\subset\{|z-z_j(s)|<\varepsilon\}$ for some $z_j(s)\in\Omega_s(Z(s),\varepsilon)$, and $N_s=\mathcal{O}(\langle s\rangle^n)$. We also choose a cut-off function $\chi_\varepsilon\in C_0^\infty(\{|x|\leq 4\varepsilon\})$ verifying $\chi_\varepsilon(x)=1$ for $|x|\leq 3\varepsilon$, and, for y such that $\text{dist}(y,\Omega_j)\leq R^{-1/2}$, we write,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{T}u(y) &= \mathbf{T}(\chi(x-\text{Re } z_j(s))u)(y)+\mathbf{T}((1-\chi(x-\text{Re } z_j(s)))u)(y)\\ &=: v_j(y)+w_j(y).\end{aligned} \tag{5.4}$$

Then, if we take $R^{-1/2}=\varepsilon$ and if x is in the support of $1-\chi(x-\text{Re } z_j(s))$, we have $|x-\text{Re } y|\geq|x-\text{Re } z_j(s)|-|y-z_j(s)|\geq\varepsilon$. We deduce from this,

$$e^{-\Phi_0(y)/h}|w_j(y)|\leq e^{-\varepsilon^2/2h}\|u\|_{L^2}, \tag{5.5}$$

and thus, by the properties of continuity of $\text{Op}_R(\tilde{a})$ (see [Sj, MNS2]),

$$\|\text{Op}_R(\tilde{a})w_j\|_{L^2_{\Phi_0}(\Omega_j)}\leq C\langle s\rangle^k e^{-\varepsilon^2/2h}\|u\|_{L^2}. \tag{5.6}$$

On the other hand, using (5.3), if x in the support of $\chi(x-\text{Re } z_j(s))$ and $z\in\Omega_j$, along $\gamma_R(z)$ we obtain,

$$\text{Re } \big((z-y)(i\zeta-x+(y+z)/2)\big)\leq-\frac{R}{2}|z-y|^2+4\varepsilon^2.$$

In particular, on the boundary of $\gamma_R(z)$ we have,

$$\text{Re } \big((z-y)(i\zeta-x+(y+z)/2)\big)\leq-\frac{1}{4},$$

and by taking a slightly modified contour, of the form,

$$\zeta = -\mathrm{Im}\, z + iR(\overline{z-y}) - i(x - \mathrm{Re}\, z)\chi_0\big(R^{1/2}(y-z)\big) \quad ; \quad |y-z| \leq R^{-1/2},$$

with $\chi_0(0) = 1$, $\chi_0(r) = 0$ if $|r| \geq 1/2$, we see that in this way (and possibly by taking R larger), we obtain a good contour for the phase Re $\big((z-y)(i\zeta - x + (y+z)/2)\big)$. Indeed, along the new contour we have,

$$\mathrm{Re}\, \big((z-y)(i\zeta - x + (y+z)/2)\big) \leq -\frac{R}{2}|z-y|^2 + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon R^{1/2}|z-y|^2),$$

where, actually, $\varepsilon R^{1/2} = 1$. As a consequence, and still for x in the support of $\chi(x - \mathrm{Re}\, z_j(s))$, we can apply the analytic stationary phase theorem to compute the symbol b (see [Sj], Theorem 2.1). In particular, setting,

$$y' := \frac{y+z}{2} + i\zeta \quad ; \quad \xi = -i(y-z),$$

the integral becomes,

$$b(x,z;h) = \frac{1}{(2\pi h)^n}\int_{\gamma'(z)} e^{i(x-y')\xi/h} a(y')dy'd\xi,$$

where $\gamma'(z)$ is a necessarily good contour, along which,

$$\begin{aligned} |x-y'| = |x + i\zeta - (y+z)/2| &\leq |\zeta - i(z-x)| + |y-z|/2 \\ &\leq 2|x - \mathrm{Re}\, z| + 3|y-z|/2 \leq CR^{-1/2}; \\ \mathrm{Re}\,(i(x-y')\xi) \leq -R|x-y'|^2/C, & \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $C > 0$ independent of R and j. Therefore, we are reduced to the same situation as in [Sj], Example 2.6, and, for all $N \geq 1$, we obtain,

$$b(x,z;h) = a(x) + R_N(x,z;h),$$

with,

$$|R_N(x,z;h)| \leq C'h^N(N+1)^nC^{-N}N! \sup_{|y-x|\leq CR^{-1/2}} |a(y)|.$$

Taking $N = 1/(C_1h)$ with $C_1 \gg C$, and using the assumption on a, we finally obtain,

$$|b(x,z;h) - a(x)| \leq \langle s\rangle^k e^{-\delta/h},$$

uniformly for $x \in \mathrm{Supp}\,\chi(x - \mathrm{Re}\, z_j(s))$ and $z \in \Omega_j$, and where $\delta > 0$ does not depend on j.

Coming back to the decomposition (5.4), setting $\chi_j(x) := \chi(x - \mathrm{Re}\, z_j(s))$, and using (5.2), this easily leads to,

$$|\mathrm{Op}_R(\tilde{a})\mathbf{T}(1-\chi_j)u(z) - \mathbf{T}(1-\chi_j)au(z)| \leq \langle s\rangle^k e^{(\Phi_0(z)-\delta)/h}\|u\|_{L^2},$$

for all $z \in \Omega_j$), and thus, using (5.5)-(5.6),

$$\left\| \mathbf{T}(au) - \mathrm{Op}_R(\tilde{a})\mathbf{T}u \right\|_{L^2_{\Phi_0}(\Omega_j)} = \mathcal{O}(\langle s\rangle^k e^{-\delta'/h}\|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}),$$

with $\delta' = \min(\delta, \varepsilon^2/2)$. Summing over $j \in \{1, \cdots, N_s\}$, we finally obtain,

$$\left\| \mathbf{T}(au) - \mathrm{Op}_R(\tilde{a})\mathbf{T}u \right\|_{L^2_{\Phi_0}(\Omega_s(Z(s),\varepsilon))} = \mathcal{O}(\langle s\rangle^{k+n} e^{-\delta'/h}\|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}),$$

and since $s = \mathcal{O}(h^{-1})$, the result follows. $\square$

Setting,

$$w(s) := G_0(s)\tilde{v}(s) = G_0(s)\mathbf{T}(e^{-ihsH}u_0),$$

we deduce from Propositions 5.1 and 4.6 that, for any $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}^n \cap \{|\mathrm{Im}\, z| > \delta'\}$ and for some constants $\varepsilon > 0$ and $C > 0$, $w(s)$ verifies,

$$\left\| ih\frac{\partial w}{\partial s} - L(s)w(s) \right\|_{L^2_{\Phi_0}(\Omega_s(z_0,\varepsilon))} \leq Ce^{-1/Ch}, \tag{5.7}$$

where we have set,

$$L(s) := G_0(s)\tilde{Q}G_0(s)^{-1} - (\partial_s W)(s, hD_z). \tag{5.8}$$

Then, as in the C^∞ case, the following analogue of [Na3] Lemma 3.1 is essential.

Proposition 5.2. *Let $(x_0,\xi_0) \in T^*\mathbb{R}^n\backslash 0$ be forward non trapping, and set,*

$$z_+(x_0,\xi_0) := x_+(x_0,\xi_0) - i\xi_+(x_0,\xi_0).$$

Then, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, the operator $B(s) := G_0(s)\widetilde{Q}G_0(s)^{-1}$ is an analytic pseudodifferential operator on $H_{\Phi_0}(\Omega_s(z_+(x_0,\xi_0),\varepsilon))$, with a symbol b verifying,

$$\begin{aligned} b(s,z,\zeta;h) = (\tilde{q}_0 + h\tilde{q}_1 + h^2\tilde{q}_2)(z + \partial_\zeta\widetilde{W}(s,\zeta),\zeta) + \mathcal{O}(h\langle s\rangle^{-1-\sigma}) \\ + \mathcal{O}(h^2\langle s\rangle^{-\sigma} + h^3\langle s\rangle^{1-\sigma}), \end{aligned}$$

uniformly for $s \geq 0$, $z \in \Omega_s(z_+(x_0,\xi_0),\varepsilon))$, $|\zeta + \mathrm{Im}\, z|$ small enough, and $h > 0$ small enough.

Proof. We first observe that, by (4.12), we have,

$$\tilde{Q}G_0(s)^{-1}v(z) = \frac{1}{(2\pi h)^n}\int_{\gamma'(s,z)} e^{i(z-y)\eta/h - i\widetilde{W}(s,\eta)/h}\tilde{q}(z,\eta;h)v(y)dyd\eta,$$

where $\tilde{q}(z,\eta;h) := e^{-iz\eta/h}\widetilde{Q}(e^{i(\cdot)\eta/h})$ is nothing but the symbol of $\widetilde{Q}$ for the standard quantization (see [Sj], Section 4), and, using the symbolic calculus (see, e.g., [Ma2] Section 2) and Assumption A, one finds,

$$\tilde{q} = \tilde{q}_0 + h\tilde{q}_1 + h^2\tilde{q}_2 + hr_0(z+i\eta,\eta) + h^2 r_1(z+i\eta,\eta) + h^3 r_2(z+i\eta,\eta),$$

where the $\tilde{q}_j$'s ($0 \leq j \leq 2$) are defined in (3.6), and the $r_j(z,\zeta)$'s are holomorphic functions of (z,ζ) on $\Sigma_\nu \times \mathbb{C}^n$, and verify,

$$r_j(z,\zeta;h) = \mathcal{O}(\langle z\rangle^{j-1-\sigma}), \quad (j = 0,1,2),$$

uniformly with respect to $z \in \Sigma_\nu$ and $h > 0$ small enough, and locally uniformly with respect to $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}^n$.

Then, we have,

$$G_0(s)\tilde{Q}G_0(s)^{-1}v(z) = \frac{1}{(2\pi h)^{2n}} \int_{\Gamma(s,z)} e^{i\phi/h}\tilde{q}(y,\eta;h)v(x)dxd\eta dyd\zeta,$$

where

$$\phi = \phi(s,x,y,z,\eta,\zeta) := (z-y)\zeta + (y-x)\eta + \widetilde{W}(s,\zeta) - \widetilde{W}(s,\eta),$$

and $\Gamma(s,z)$ is the $4n$-contour given by,

$$\Gamma(s,z) : \quad (y,\zeta) \in \gamma(s,z)\,;\, (x,\eta) \in \gamma'(s,y).$$

(The $2n$-contours $\gamma(s,z)$ and $\gamma'(s,y)$ are defined in (4.7) and (4.13), respectively.) In particular, $\Gamma(s,z)$ is automatically a good contour for the phase $\Phi_0(x) - \text{Im}\,\phi$, uniformly with respect to $s \geq 0$.

Now, we write,

$$\widetilde{W}(s,\zeta) - \widetilde{W}(s,\eta) = (\zeta - \eta)\widetilde{W}_1(s,\zeta,\eta),$$

where $\widetilde{W}_1$ is well defined and holomorphic near $\zeta = \eta = \xi_+(x_0,\xi_0)$, and is equal to $\partial_\zeta \widetilde{W}(s,\zeta)$ when $\eta = \zeta$. Thus, we have,

$$\Phi = (z-x)\eta + (z - y + \widetilde{W}_1(s,\zeta,\eta))(\zeta - \eta).$$

Setting $y' = y - \widetilde{W}_1(s,\zeta,\eta)$ (and dropping the prime), we obtain,

$$G_0(s)\tilde{Q}G_0(s)^{-1}v(z) = \frac{1}{(2\pi h)^{2n}} \int_{\Gamma'(s,z)} e^{i(y-x)\eta/h + i(z-y)\zeta/h} \times \tilde{q}(y + \widetilde{W}_1,\eta;h)v(x)dxd\eta dyd\zeta, \tag{5.9}$$

with $\Gamma'(s,z)$ given by,

$$\Gamma'(s,z) : \quad (y + \widetilde{W}_1(s,\zeta,\eta),\zeta) \in \gamma(s,z)\,;\, (x,\eta) \in \gamma'(s,y + \widetilde{W}_1). \tag{5.10}$$

Of course, $\Gamma'(s,z)$ is necessarily a good contour for the new phase $\Phi_0(x) - \text{Im}\,((y-x)\eta + (z-y)\zeta)$, uniformly with respect to s, and another such uniform good contour is given by,

$$\Gamma_1'(s,z) : \begin{cases} \eta = -\text{Im}\, z + i(\overline{z-x}); \\ \zeta = \eta + i(\overline{z-y}); \\ |z-x| < r\,;\, |z-y| < r, \end{cases} \tag{5.11}$$

with $r > 0$ small enough.

As before, the possibility of substitution of $\Gamma_1'(s,z)$ to $\Gamma'(s,z)$ is not completely obvious, but we prove it in the Appendix (see Lemma A.2). As a consequence (and up to exponentially small terms in $H_{\Phi_0}(\Omega_s(z_+(x_0,\xi_0),\varepsilon))$), we obtain,

$$G_0(s)\tilde{Q}G_0(s)^{-1}v(z) = \frac{1}{(2\pi h)^n}\int_{\gamma(z)} e^{i(z-x)\eta/h} b(s,z,\eta)v(x)dxd\eta, \tag{5.12}$$

with,

$$b(s,z,\eta) = \frac{1}{(2\pi h)^n}\int_{\gamma'(z,\eta)} e^{i(z-y)(\zeta-\eta)/h}\tilde{q}(y+\widetilde{W}_1(s,\zeta,\eta),\eta;h)dyd\zeta$$

and where the two $2n$-contours of integration are given by,

$$\gamma(z) \,:\left\{\begin{array}{l} \eta = -\mathrm{Im}\, z + i(\overline{z-x});\\ |z-x| < r, \end{array}\right.$$

$$\gamma'(z,\eta) \,:\left\{\begin{array}{l} \zeta = \eta + i(\overline{z-y});\\ |z-y| < r. \end{array}\right.$$

Here, we must observe that, for $|\eta + \mathrm{Im}\, z| + |\zeta-\eta| + |y-z|$ small enough and $z \in \Omega_s(z_+(x_0,\xi_0),\varepsilon))$, one has,

$$y + \widetilde{W}_1(s,\zeta,\eta) = z_+(x_0,\xi_0) + \partial_\zeta\widetilde{W}(s,\xi_+(x_0,\xi_0)) + \langle s\rangle\theta$$

with $\theta \in \mathbb{C}^n$, $|\theta|$ arbitrarily small (uniformly with respect to s). Moreover, by Lemma 3.1 and (4.4), we also have,

$$|\partial_\zeta\widetilde{W}(s,\xi_+(x_0,\xi_0))| \geq \frac{s}{C} - C,$$

for some constant $C > 0$. Therefore, since $\partial_\zeta\widetilde{W}(s,\xi_+(x_0,\xi_0))$ is real, we deduce that $y+\widetilde{W}_1(s,\zeta,\eta)$ remains in Σ_ν, and thus $\tilde{q}(y+\widetilde{W}_1(s,\zeta,\eta),\eta;h)$ is a well defined symbol in the region of integration. As a consequence, we can apply the analytic stationary phase theorem again (exactly as in [Sj] Example 2.6), and we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} b(s,z,\eta;h) \quad &\sim \quad \sum_{k\geq 0}\frac{h^k}{i^k k!}(\nabla_y\cdot\nabla_\zeta)^k\tilde{q}(y+\widetilde{W}_1(s,\zeta,\eta),\eta;h)\Big|_{\substack{y=z\\ \zeta=\eta}}\\ &\sim \quad \sum_{j\geq 0} h^j b_j(s,z,\eta) \end{aligned}$$

in the sense of analytic symbols on $\{(z,\eta);\, z \in \Omega_s(z_+(x_0,\xi_0),\varepsilon)),\ |\eta + \mathrm{Im}\, z| < r\}$, and uniformly with respect to s, with,

$$\begin{aligned} &b_0(s,z,\eta) = \tilde{q}_0(z+\partial_\zeta\widetilde{W}(s,\eta),\eta);\\ &b_1(s,z,\eta) = \tilde{q}_1(z+\partial_\zeta\widetilde{W}(s,\eta),\eta) + \mathcal{O}(\langle s\rangle^{-1-\sigma});\\ &b_2(s,z,\eta) = \tilde{q}_2(z+\partial_\zeta\widetilde{W}(s,\eta),\eta) + \mathcal{O}(\langle s\rangle^{-\sigma});\\ &b_j(s,z,\eta) = \mathcal{O}(\langle s\rangle^{1-\sigma}) \quad (j\geq 3), \end{aligned}$$

uniformly for $s \geq 0$, $z \in \Omega_s(z_+(x_0,\xi_0),\varepsilon))$, $|\eta + \mathrm{Im}\, z| < r$.

In view of (5.12), this concludes the proof of Proposition 5.2. $\square$

6 Proof of Theorem 2.1

We start from (5.7)-(5.8) with $z_0 = z_+(x_0,\xi_0)$, where (x_0,ξ_0) is forward non trapping. Proposition 5.2 tells us that $L(s)$ is an analytic pseudodifferential operator on $H_{\Phi_0}(\Omega_s(z_+(x_0,\xi_0),\varepsilon))$, with symbol $\ell(s,z,\zeta;h)$ verifying,

$$\begin{aligned}\ell(s,z,\zeta;h) = (\tilde{q}_0 + h\tilde{q}_1 + h^2\tilde{q}_2)(z + \partial_\zeta \widetilde{W}(s,\zeta),\zeta) - (\partial_s W)(s,\zeta)\\ + \mathcal{O}(h\langle s\rangle^{-1-\sigma} + h^2\langle s\rangle^{-\sigma} + h^3\langle s\rangle^{1-\sigma}).\end{aligned}$$

In particular, uniformly for $s \in [0, T/h]$ with $T > 0$ fixed, we obtain,

$$\ell(s,z,\zeta;h) = q(z + i\zeta + \partial_\zeta \widetilde{W}(s,\zeta),\zeta;h) - (\partial_s W)(s,\zeta) + \mathcal{O}(h\langle s\rangle^{-1-\sigma}),$$

where $q = q_0 + hq_1 + h^2 q_2$ is as in Section 3.

Then, denoting by $\kappa(x,\xi) := (x - i\xi, \xi)$ the complex canonical map associated with $\mathbf{T}$, we observe that the Hamilton flow $\widetilde{R}_s$ of $\ell_0(s,z,\zeta;h) := q(z + i\zeta + \partial_\zeta \widetilde{W}(s,\zeta),\zeta;h) - (\partial_s W)(s,\zeta)$ is given by,

$$\widetilde{R}_s = \kappa \circ R_s \circ \kappa^{-1},$$

with,

$$R_s(x,\xi;h) := (\tilde{x}(s,x,\xi;h) - \partial_\zeta \widetilde{W}(s,\tilde{\xi}(s,x,\xi;h)), \tilde{\xi}(s,x,\xi;h)),$$

(where, as before, $(\tilde{x}(s,x,\xi;h), \tilde{\xi}(s,x,\xi;h)) = \exp sH_q(x,\xi)$).

Then, by Lemma 4.2, we see that for any fixed $t > 0$ and for any (x,ξ) in a small enough complex neighborhood of (x_0,ξ_0), one has

$$\lim_{h\to 0_+} \widetilde{R}_{t/h}(x - i\xi, \xi; h) = (x_+(x,\xi) - i\xi_+(x,\xi), \xi_+(x,\xi)).$$

Let us also observe that, by construction, we have,

$$\ell_0(s,z,\zeta;h) = q(z + i\zeta + \partial_\zeta \widetilde{W}(s,\zeta),\zeta;h) - q(\partial_\zeta W(s,\zeta),\zeta;h),$$

and thus, for (z,ζ) close enough to $(z_+(x_0,\xi_0), \xi_+(x_0,\xi_0))$, we obtain,

$$\ell_0(s,z,\zeta;h) = \mathcal{O}(\langle s\rangle^{-\sigma-1} + h\langle s\rangle^{-\sigma} + h^2\langle s\rangle^{1-\sigma}) = \mathcal{O}(\langle s\rangle^{-\sigma-1}),$$

uniformly for $h > 0$ small enough and $s \in [0, T/h]$.

¿From this point, the proof becomes very similar to that of the short range case [MNS2], and we only sketch it.

Setting $(\tilde{z}_s(z,\zeta),\tilde{\zeta}_s(z,\zeta)) := \widetilde{R}_s(z,\zeta)$ and $z_1 := \tilde{z}_{s_1}(x_0 - i\xi_0, \xi_0)$ with $s_1 > 0$ large enough, then for all $s \geq 0$, one first construct an analytic Fourier integral operator,

$$F(s) : H_{\Phi_0, z_1} \to H_{\Phi_0, \tilde{z}_s(z_1, -\mathrm{Im}\, z_1)},$$

of the form,

$$F(s)v(z) = \frac{1}{(2\pi h)^n}\int_{\gamma_s(z)} e^{i(\psi(s,z,\eta) - y\eta)/h} v(y)dyd\eta,$$

where $\gamma_s(z)$ is a convenient $2n$-contour and ψ is a holomorphic function of (z,η) near $(\tilde{z}_s(z_1, -\mathrm{Im}\, z_1), -\mathrm{Im}\, z_1)$, solution of the system (eikonal equation),

$$\left\{\begin{array}{l} \partial_s\psi + \ell_0(s, z, \nabla_z\psi; h) = 0; \\ \psi\,|_{s=0} = z.\eta, \end{array}\right. \tag{6.1}$$

In particular, ψ also depends on h (but in a well-controled way), and it quantizes the canonical map $\widetilde{R}_s$, in the sense that one has,

$$(z, \nabla_z\psi(s,z,\eta)) = \widetilde{R}_s(\nabla_\eta\psi(s,z,\eta)).$$

Moreover, $F(s)$ verifies,

$$ih\partial_s F(s) - L(s)F(s) = hF_1(s),$$

where $F_1(s) : H_{\Phi_0,z_1} \to H_{\Phi_0,\tilde{z}_s(z_1,-\mathrm{Im}\, z_1)}$ has the same form as $F(s)$, but with some symbol $f_1(s,z,\eta;h)$ that is $\mathcal{O}(\langle s\rangle^{-1-\sigma})$ uniformly for $s \in [0, T/h]$, $h > 0$ small enough. Moreover, using that, for any $t > 0$, $\tilde{z}_{t/h}(z,\zeta)$ tends to $z_\infty(z,\zeta) := z_+(z + i\zeta, \zeta)$ as $h \to 0_+$, one can prove, as in [MNS2] Section 6, that, for any given $\varepsilon_1 > 0$, there exists $\varepsilon_2 > 0$ such that, for all $h > 0$ small enough, $F(t/h)$ sends $H_{\Phi_0}(|z - z_1| < \varepsilon_2)$ into $H_{\Phi_0}(|z - z_\infty(z_1, -\mathrm{Im}\, z_1)| < \varepsilon_1)$.

Similarly, still for $s \in [0, T/h]$, one can construct a Fourier integral operator,

$$\widetilde{F}(s) : H_{\Phi_0,\tilde{z}_s(z_1,-\mathrm{Im}\, z_1)} \to H_{\Phi_0,z_1}$$

verifying,

$$ih\partial_s\widetilde{F}(s) + \widetilde{F}(s)L(s) = h\widetilde{F}_1(s), \tag{6.2}$$

where the Fourier integral operator $\widetilde{F}_1(s)$ has the same phase as $\widetilde{F}(s)$ and a symbol $\mathcal{O}(\langle s\rangle^{-1-\sigma})$. Moreover, for any $t > 0$ and $\varepsilon_1 > 0$, there exists $\varepsilon_2 > 0$ such that, for all $h > 0$ small enough, $\widetilde{F}(t/h)$ sends $H_{\Phi_0}(|z - z_\infty(z_1, -\mathrm{Im}\, z_1)| < \varepsilon_2)$ into $H_{\Phi_0}(|z - z_1| < \varepsilon_1)$.

Then, setting,

$$\tilde{w}(s) := \widetilde{F}(s)w(s) = \widetilde{F}(s)G_0(s)\mathbf{T}(e^{-ihsH}u_0),$$

we deduce from (5.7)-(6.2) that $\tilde{w}$ verifies,

$$ih\partial_s\tilde{w}(s) = h\widetilde{F}_1(s)w(s) = h\widetilde{F}_1(s)\widetilde{A}(s)F(s)\tilde{w}(s) \quad \text{ in } H_{\Phi_0,z_1},$$

where $\widetilde{A}(s)$ is a parametrix of the elliptic analytic pseudodifferential operator $A(s) := F(s)\widetilde{F}(s)$ on $H_{\Phi_0,\tilde{z}_s(z_1,-\mathrm{Im}\, z_1)}$.

Observing that $\widetilde{F}_1(s)\widetilde{A}(s)F(s)$ is an analytic pseudodifferential operator on H_{Φ_0,z_1}, with symbol uniformly $\mathcal{O}(\langle s\rangle^{-1-s})$ for $s\in[0,T/h]$, we easily deduce,

$$\left|\partial_s\|\tilde{w}(s)\|^2_{L^2_{\tilde{\Phi}_0}(|z-z_1|<\varepsilon_1)}\right| \leq C\langle s\rangle^{-1-\sigma}\|\tilde{w}(s)\|^2_{L^2_{\tilde{\Phi}_0}(|z-z_1|<2\varepsilon_1)}, \tag{6.3}$$

for some positive constants ε_1 small enough and C large enough, and where $\tilde{\Phi}_0$ is such that $|\tilde{\Phi}_0-\Phi_0|$ and $|\nabla_{(z,\overline{z})}(\tilde{\Phi}_0-\Phi_0)|$ are small enough, $\tilde{\Phi}_0\geq\Phi_0$ on $\{|z-z_1|\leq\varepsilon_1\}$, $\tilde{\Phi}_0=\Phi_0$ on $\{|z-z_1|\leq\varepsilon_1/4\}$, and $\tilde{\Phi}_0>\Phi_0+\delta_1$ on $\{|z-z_1|\geq\varepsilon_1/2\}$ for some constant $\delta_1>0$.

Note that, in (6.3), the estimate is better than the analogous one obtained for the short range case in [MNS2] (see formula (5.6) in [MNS2]). This is due to the fact that, in (6.1), we have left the whole symbol ℓ_0 instead of taking just its principal part $q_0(z+i\zeta+\partial_\zeta\widetilde{W}(s,\zeta),\zeta;h)-q_0(\partial_\zeta\widetilde{W}(s,\zeta),\zeta;h)$. In [MNS2], this had some interest because the symbol obtained in this way did not depend on h, and the construction could be done for all $s\geq 0$ (without limitation of order h^{-1}). But here, in any case we have an h-dependence inside $\widetilde{W}$.

Because of the choice of $\tilde{\Phi}_0$, and the fact that $\|e^{-ihsH}u_0\|_{L^2}=\|u_0\|_{L^2}$ does not depend on s, we deduce from (6.3),

$$\left|\partial_s\|\tilde{w}(s)\|^2_{L^2_{\tilde{\Phi}_0}(|z-z_1|<\varepsilon_1)}\right| \leq C\langle s\rangle^{-1-\sigma}\|\tilde{w}(s)\|^2_{L^2_{\tilde{\Phi}_0}(|z-z_1|<\varepsilon_1)} + Ce^{-\delta_1/h},$$

with some constant $\delta_1>0$, and thus, since $\int_0^\infty\langle s\rangle^{-1-\sigma}ds<\infty$, we obtain,

$$\|\tilde{w}(s)\|^2_{L^2_{\tilde{\Phi}_0}(|z-z_1|<\varepsilon_1)} \leq C'\|\tilde{w}(0)\|^2_{L^2_{\tilde{\Phi}_0}(|z-z_1|<\varepsilon_1)} + C'e^{-\delta_1/h}; \tag{6.4}$$

$$\|\tilde{w}(0)\|^2_{L^2_{\tilde{\Phi}_0}(|z-z_1|<\varepsilon_1)} \leq C'\|\tilde{w}(s)\|^2_{L^2_{\tilde{\Phi}_0}(|z-z_1|<\varepsilon_1)} + C'e^{-\delta_1/h}, \tag{6.5}$$

with some new constant $C'>0$, and where the inequalities holds for all $s\in[0,T/h]$, $h>0$ small enough.

Now, if (x_0,ξ_0) is not in $WF_a(u_0)$, then, by standard propagation of singularities (see, e.g., [Ma2]), we know that $R_{s_1}(x_0,\xi_0)\notin WF_a(u)$, and thus

$\tilde{w}(0)$ is exponentially small in a neighborhood of $z_1 := \kappa \circ R_{s_1}(x_0, \xi_0)$. Then, (6.4) tells us that, for all $s \in [0, T/h]$, $\tilde{w}(s)$ is exponentially small in some fixed neighborhood of z_1. In particular, taking $s = t/h$ with $t > 0$ fixed, we deduce that, for h small enough, $G_0(t/h)\mathbf{T}(e^{-itH}u_0)$ is exponentially small near $z_\infty(z_1, -\mathrm{Im}\, z_1) = z_+(x_0, \xi_0)$. The converse can be seen in the same way by using (6.5), and thus Theorem 2.1 is proved.

APPENDIX

A Deformation of non-local good contours

Lemma A.1. *Let $\Gamma_0(s,z)$ and $\Gamma_1(s,z)$ be the two contours given in (4.10)-(4.11) with $R \geq 1$ large enough.*
Then, there exists a deformation of contours $[0,1] \ni t \mapsto \widetilde{\Gamma}_t(s,z)$ with $\widetilde{\Gamma}_0(s,z) \subset \Gamma_0(s,z)$ and $\widetilde{\Gamma}_1(s,z) \subset \Gamma_1(s,z)$, such that, for all $t \in [0,1]$, $\widetilde{\Gamma}_t(s,z)$ is a good contour for the phase $(z', y, \zeta, \eta) \mapsto \Phi_0(y) - \mathrm{Im}\, ((z-z')\zeta + (z'-y)\eta + \widetilde{W}(s,\eta))$ uniformly with respect to s, and, for $j = 0, 1$, one has,

$$\inf_{s\geq 0} \inf_{\Gamma_j(s,z)\backslash\widetilde{\Gamma}_j(s,z)} \left[\Phi_0(y) - \Phi_0(z) - \mathrm{Im}\, ((z-z')\zeta + (z'-y)\eta + \widetilde{W}(s,\eta))\right] < 0.$$

Moreover, for any $\varepsilon_1 > 0$, if $z \in \Omega_s(z_+(x_0,\xi_0),\varepsilon_2)$ with $\varepsilon_2 > 0$ small enough, then, along $\Gamma_t(s,z)$, both η and ζ remain in an arbitrary small neighborhood of $\xi_+(x_0,\xi_0)$, while y remains in $\Omega_s(Z_s,\varepsilon_1)$. In particular, in the integral (4.9) one can substitue $\Gamma_1(s,z)$ to $\Gamma_0(s,z)$, up to an exponentially small term in $H_{\Phi_0}(\Omega_s(z_+(x_0,\xi_0),\varepsilon_2)))$.

Proof. First of all, using the fact that $\widetilde{W}$ is real on the real, by a Taylor expansion we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Im}\, \widetilde{W}(s,\eta) &= \mathrm{Im}\, \eta \cdot \nabla_\zeta \widetilde{W}(s, \mathrm{Re}\, \eta) + \mathcal{O}(\langle s\rangle |\mathrm{Im}\, \eta|^3) \\ &= \mathrm{Im}\, \eta \cdot \nabla_\zeta \widetilde{W}(s, -\mathrm{Im}\, z) + \mathrm{Im}\, \eta \cdot A_s(z)(\mathrm{Re}\, \eta + \mathrm{Im}\, z) \\ &\qquad + \mathcal{O}(\langle s\rangle |\mathrm{Im}\, \eta|^3 + \langle s\rangle |\mathrm{Im}\, \eta|\, |\mathrm{Re}\, \eta + \mathrm{Im}\, z|^2).\end{aligned}$$

Then, inserting this expression into the phase

$$\Phi_1 := \Phi_0(y) - \Phi_0(z) - \mathrm{Im}\, ((z-z')\zeta + (z'-y)\eta + \widetilde{W}(s,\eta)),$$

and setting

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde\eta &= \mathrm{Re}\,\eta + \mathrm{Im}\,z + i\langle s\rangle \mathrm{Im}\,\eta;\\
\tilde y &= \langle s\rangle^{-1}\big(\mathrm{Re}\,(y-z) - \nabla_\zeta \widetilde{W}(s,-\mathrm{Im}\,z)\big) + i\mathrm{Im}\,(y-z);\\
\tilde\zeta &= \zeta + \mathrm{Im}\,z;\\
\tilde z &= z' - z,
\end{aligned} \tag{A.1}$$

we easily obtain,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_1 &= Q_s(\tilde\eta,\tilde\zeta,\tilde y,\tilde z) + \mathcal{O}(\langle s\rangle^{-2}|\mathrm{Im}\,\tilde\eta|^3 + |\mathrm{Im}\,\tilde\eta|\,|\mathrm{Re}\,\tilde\eta|^2)\\
&= Q_s(\tilde\eta,\tilde\zeta,\tilde y,\tilde z) + \mathcal{O}(|\tilde\eta|^3),
\end{aligned} \tag{A.2}$$

where Q_s is a uniformly non-degenerate real-quadratic form on $\mathbb{C}^{4n}$, with uniformly bounded coefficients, such that, along the two contours $\Gamma_0(s,z)$ and $\Gamma_1(s,z)$, one has,

$$Q_s(\tilde\eta,\tilde\zeta,\tilde y,\tilde z) \le -\delta\big(|\tilde\eta|^2 + |\tilde\zeta|^2\big),$$

for some positive constant δ. Actually, we find,

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_s(\tilde\eta,\tilde\zeta,\tilde y,\tilde z) &= \frac{1}{2}(\mathrm{Im}\,\tilde y)^2 + \mathrm{Im}\,(\tilde z\,\tilde\zeta) + \mathrm{Im}\,(\tilde y\,\tilde\eta) - \mathrm{Re}\,\tilde\eta\,\mathrm{Im}\,\tilde z\\
&\quad -\frac{1}{\langle s\rangle}\mathrm{Re}\,\tilde z\,\mathrm{Im}\,\tilde\eta - \mathrm{Im}\,\tilde\eta\cdot \widetilde{A}_s(z)\mathrm{Re}\,\tilde\eta,
\end{aligned}$$

where we have set,

$$\widetilde{A}_s(z) := \langle s\rangle^{-1}A_s(z) = \mathcal{O}(1).$$

On the other hand, we see that the contour $\Gamma_0(s,z)$ is given by,

$$\Gamma_0(s,z) : \begin{cases} \tilde\eta = -i\overline{\tilde y} - i(\widetilde{A}_s(z)\mathrm{Im}\,\tilde y + a_s(z,\tilde z));\\ \tilde\zeta = -iR\overline{\tilde z}\,; \quad |\mathrm{Re}\,\tilde y + a_s(z,\tilde z)| + |\mathrm{Im}\,\tilde y| < r\,;\ |\tilde z| < r, \end{cases}$$

with,

$$\begin{aligned}
a_s(z,\tilde z) &:= \langle s\rangle^{-1}\big(\mathrm{Re}\,(z-z') + \partial_\zeta\widetilde{W}(s,-\mathrm{Im}\,z) - \partial_\zeta\widetilde{W}(s,-\mathrm{Im}\,z')\big)\\
&= -\langle s\rangle^{-1}\mathrm{Re}\,\tilde z + \widetilde{A}_s(z)\mathrm{Im}\,\tilde z + \mathcal{O}(|\mathrm{Im}\,\tilde z|^2),
\end{aligned}$$

while $\Gamma_1(s,z)$ can be written as,

$$\Gamma_1(s,z) : \begin{cases} \tilde\eta = -i\overline{\tilde y} - i\widetilde{A}_s(z)\mathrm{Im}\,\tilde y;\\ \tilde\zeta = -iR\overline{\tilde z} + \mathrm{Re}\,\tilde\eta + i\langle s\rangle^{-1}\mathrm{Im}\,\tilde\eta;\\ |\mathrm{Re}\,\tilde y| + |\mathrm{Im}\,\tilde y| < r'\,;\ |\tilde z| < r', \end{cases}$$

that is,

$$\Gamma_1(s,z):\begin{cases}\tilde\eta = -i\overline{\tilde y} - i\widetilde{A}_s(z)\mathrm{Im}\,\tilde y;\\ \tilde\zeta = -iR\overline{\tilde z} - \mathrm{Im}\,\tilde y - i\langle s\rangle^{-1}(\mathrm{Re}\,\tilde y + \widetilde{A}_s(z)\mathrm{Im}\,\tilde y);\\ |\mathrm{Re}\,\tilde y| + |\mathrm{Im}\,\tilde y| < r'\,;\ |\tilde z| < r'.\end{cases}$$

Then, for $t\in[0,1]$, we set,

$$\widetilde{\Gamma}_t(s,z):\begin{cases}\tilde\eta = -i\overline{\tilde y} - i(\widetilde{A}_s(z)\mathrm{Im}\,\tilde y + (1-t)a_s(z,\tilde z));\\ \tilde\zeta = -iR\overline{\tilde z} - t\mathrm{Im}\,\tilde y - it\langle s\rangle^{-1}(\mathrm{Re}\,\tilde y + \widetilde{A}_s(z)\mathrm{Im}\,\tilde y);\\ |\tilde y| + |\tilde z| < r'',\end{cases}$$

where $r''>0$ is taken sufficiently small in order to have,

$$\{|\tilde y| + |\tilde z| < r''\} \subset \big(\{|\mathrm{Re}\,\tilde y + a_s(z,\tilde z)| + |\mathrm{Im}\,\tilde y| < r\,;\,|\tilde z| < r,\}$$
$$\cap\{|\mathrm{Re}\,\tilde y| + |\mathrm{Im}\,\tilde y| < r'\,;\,|\tilde z| < r'\}\big).$$

A straightforward computations shows that, along $\widetilde{\Gamma}_t(s,z)$, one has,

$$Q_s(\tilde\eta,\tilde\zeta,\tilde y,\tilde z) \le -\frac{1}{2}(\mathrm{Im}\,\tilde y)^2 - (\mathrm{Re}\,\tilde y + \widetilde{A}_s(z)\mathrm{Im}\,\tilde y)^2 - R|\tilde z|^2$$
$$+C|z|\,(|z| + |\mathrm{Im}\,\tilde y| + |\mathrm{Re}\,\tilde y + \widetilde{A}_s(z)\mathrm{Im}\,\tilde y|),$$

where the constant C does not depend on the choice of R. As a consequence, by choosing R sufficiently large, along $\widetilde{\Gamma}_t(s,z)$ we obtain,

$$Q_s(\tilde\eta,\tilde\zeta,\tilde y,\tilde z) \le -\delta\big(|\tilde y|^2 + |\tilde z|^2\big),$$

with some constant $\delta>0$. Since $|\tilde y| + |\tilde z| \sim |\tilde\eta| + |\tilde\zeta|$ on $\widetilde{\Gamma}_t(s,z)$ (in the sense that both quotients of these quantities are uniformly bounded), in view of (A.2) this means that $\widetilde{\Gamma}_t(s,z)$ is a good contour for the phase Φ_1.

Finally, along on $\widetilde{\Gamma}_t(s,z)$, all vectors $\tilde\eta,\tilde\zeta,\tilde y,\tilde z$ remain in an arbitrarily small neighborhood of 0. As a consequence, we see on (A.1) that both η and ζ remain in an arbitrary small neighborhood of $\xi_+(x_0,\xi_0)$, while y remains in $\Omega_s(Z_s,\varepsilon_1)$ ($\varepsilon_1>0$ arbitrary) if $z\in\Omega_s(z_+(x_0,\xi_0),\varepsilon_2)$ with $\varepsilon_2>0$ is small enough. ☐

Lemma A.2. *Let $\Gamma'(s,z)$ and $\Gamma'_1(s,z)$ be the two contours given in (5.10)-(5.11).*
Then, there exists a deformation of contours $[0,1]\ni t\mapsto\Gamma_t(s,z)$ with $\Gamma_0(s,z)\subset\Gamma'(s,z)$ and $\Gamma_1(s,z)\subset\Gamma'_1(s,z)$, such that, for all $t\in[0,1]$, $\Gamma_t(s,z)$ is a good contour for the phase $(x,y,\zeta,\eta)\mapsto\Phi_0(x)-\mathrm{Im}\,((y-x)\eta+(z-y)\zeta)$ uniformly with respect to s, and one has,

$$\inf_{s\ge0}\ \inf_{\Gamma'(s,z)\backslash\Gamma_0(s,z)}\big[\Phi_0(x)-\Phi_0(z)-\mathrm{Im}\,((y-x)\eta+(z-y)\zeta)\big]<0;$$
$$\inf_{s\ge0}\ \inf_{\Gamma'_1(s,z)\backslash\Gamma_1(s,z)}\big[\Phi_0(x)-\Phi_0(z)-\mathrm{Im}\,((y-x)\eta+(z-y)\zeta)\big]<0$$

Moreover, if $z \in \Omega_s(z_+(x_0,\xi_0),\varepsilon)$ with $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, then, along $\Gamma_t(s,z)$, the quantity $y+\widetilde{W}_1(s,\zeta,\eta)$ remains inside Σ_ν. In particular, in the integral (5.9) one can substitue $\Gamma'_1(s,z)$ to $\Gamma'(s,z)$, up to an exponentially small term in $H_{\Phi_0}(\Omega_s(z_+(x_0,\xi_0),\varepsilon))$.

Proof. We first observe that, along $\Gamma'(s,z)$, we have,

$$|\mathrm{Re}\,\eta+\mathrm{Im}\,z|+|\mathrm{Re}\,\zeta+\mathrm{Im}\,z|\leq 2r \quad ; \quad |\mathrm{Im}\,\eta|+|\mathrm{Im}\,\zeta|\leq C_0\langle s\rangle^{-1}r,$$

with a constant $C_0>0$ independent of the choice of r. Moreover, writing,

$$\widetilde{W}_1(s,\zeta,\eta)=\int_0^1\partial_\zeta\widetilde{W}(t\zeta+(1-t)\eta)dt,$$

and using the fact that $\widetilde{W}$ is real on the real, we easily deduce,

$$\mathrm{Im}\,\widetilde{W}_1(s,\zeta,\eta)=\frac{1}{2}A_s(z)(\beta_1+\beta_2)+\mathcal{O}(|\alpha|\,|\beta|+\langle s\rangle^{-2}|\beta|^3), \tag{A.3}$$

where we have set,

$$\begin{aligned}&\alpha=(\alpha_1,\alpha_2):=(\mathrm{Re}\,\zeta+\mathrm{Im}\,z,\mathrm{Re}\,\eta+\mathrm{Im}\,z);\\&\beta=(\beta_1,\beta_2):=(\langle s\rangle\mathrm{Im}\,\zeta,\langle s\rangle\mathrm{Im}\,\eta).\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have,

$$\mathrm{Re}\,\widetilde{W}_1(s,\zeta,\eta)=\partial_\zeta\widetilde{W}(s,-\mathrm{Im}\,z)+\frac{1}{2}A_s(z)(\alpha_1+\alpha_2)+\mathcal{O}(\langle s\rangle|\alpha|^2+\langle s\rangle^{-1}|\beta|^2). \tag{A.4}$$

Substituting these expressions into the equations defining $\Gamma'(s,z)$, and setting $\widetilde{A}_s=\langle s\rangle^{-1}A_s(z)$, we find,

$$\begin{aligned}&\alpha_1+\frac{1}{2}\widetilde{A}_s(\beta_1+\beta_2)=\mathrm{Im}\,(z-y)+\mathcal{O}(|\alpha|\,|\beta|+|\beta|^3);\\&\beta_1+\frac{1}{2}\widetilde{A}_s(\alpha_1+\alpha_2)+\frac{1}{2}\widetilde{A}_s^2(\beta_1+\beta_2)\\&\qquad\qquad=\langle s\rangle^{-1}\mathrm{Re}\,(z-y)+\widetilde{A}_s\,\mathrm{Im}\,(z-y)+\mathcal{O}(|\alpha|^2+|\beta|^2);\\&\alpha_2=\mathrm{Im}\,(z-x);\\&\beta_2-\frac{1}{2}\widetilde{A}_s(\alpha_1+\alpha_2)+\frac{1}{2}\widetilde{A}_s^2(\beta_1+\beta_2)\\&\qquad\qquad=\langle s\rangle^{-1}\mathrm{Re}\,(y-x)-\widetilde{A}_s\,\mathrm{Im}\,(y-x)+\mathcal{O}(|\alpha|^2+|\beta|^2),\end{aligned}$$

where similar estimates for the derivatives can also be obtained.

In particular, since $|\alpha|+|\beta|\leq(2+C_0)r\ll 1$, $\widetilde{A}_s=\mathcal{O}(1)$, and $\widetilde{A}_s^2\geq 0$, we easily see that the implicit function theorem can be applied to the variables (α,β), and permits us to re-write the equations defining $\Gamma'(s,z)$ as,

$$\zeta=F_0(s,z,x,y) \quad ; \quad \eta=G_0(s,z,x,y),$$

where F_0 and G_0 depend smoothly on (z,x,y) (actually, analytically on Re (z,x,y) and Im (z,x,y)) in the domain of integration, and verify there,

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_0(x)-\Phi_0(z)-\mathrm{Im}\,((y-x)G_0+(z-y)F_0)&\\ \le -\delta_1\langle s\rangle^{-2}\big[|\mathrm{Re}\,(z-y)|^2+|\mathrm{Re}\,(z-x)|^2\big]&\\ -\delta_1\big[|\mathrm{Im}\,(z-y)|^2+|\mathrm{Im}\,(z-x)|^2\big],&\end{aligned}\tag{A.5}$$

for some constant $\delta_1>0$. (Here, we have also used the fact that, on $\Gamma'(s,z)$, the size of (α,β) is of the same order as that of $(\mathrm{Im}\,(z-y),\mathrm{Im}\,(z-x),\langle s\rangle^{-1}\mathrm{Re}\,(z-y),\langle s\rangle^{-1}\mathrm{Re}\,(z-x))$.)
Moreover, if $r_0>0$ is a small enough constant, the set,

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_0(s,z):=\big\{(x,z,\zeta,\eta)\,;\,\zeta=F_0(s,z,x,y),\ \eta=G_0(s,z,x,y),&\\ \langle s\rangle^{-2}|\mathrm{Re}\,(z-y)|^2+|\mathrm{Im}\,(z-y)|^2<r_0^2,&\\ \langle s\rangle^{-2}|\mathrm{Re}\,(z-x)|^2+|\mathrm{Im}\,(z-x)|^2<r_0^2\big\}&\end{aligned}$$

is included in $\Gamma'(s,z)$ for all $s\ge 0$, and it verifies,

$$\inf_{s\ge 0}\ \inf_{\Gamma'(s,z)\backslash\Gamma_0(s,z)}\big[\Phi_0(x)-\mathrm{Im}\,((y-x)\eta+(z-y)\zeta)\big]<0.$$

On the other hand, the contour $\Gamma_1'(s,z)$ can obviously be written as,

$$\zeta=F_1(s,z,x,y)\,;\,\eta=G_1(s,z,x,y)\,;\,|z-x|<r_1\,;\,|z-y|<r,$$

with,

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_0(x)-\Phi_0(z)-\mathrm{Im}\,((y-x)G_1+(z-y)F_1)&\\ \le -\delta_2\big[|z-y|^2+|z-x|^2\big],&\end{aligned}\tag{A.6}$$

for some constant $\delta_2>0$, and, possibly by shrinking r_0, we can can also assume that $r_0\le r$.

Then, for $t\in[0,1]$, we set,

$$\begin{aligned}&\rho_t(s):=\sqrt{(1-t)\langle s\rangle^{-2}+t};\\ &B_t(s,z):=\{x\in\mathbb{C}^n\,;\,\rho_t(s)^2|\mathrm{Re}\,(z-x)|^2+|\mathrm{Im}\,(z-x)|^2<r_0^2\},\end{aligned}$$

and, for $j=0,1$, we define the vector-valued functions $x_t^j(s,z,x,)$ and $y_t^j(s,z,y)$ by the formulas,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Re}\,(x_t^j-z)=\langle s\rangle^{1-j}\rho_t(s)\mathrm{Re}\,(x-z)\quad;\quad \mathrm{Im}\,x_t^j=\mathrm{Im}\,x;\\ \mathrm{Re}\,(y_t^j-z)=\langle s\rangle^{1-j}\rho_t(s)\mathrm{Re}\,(y-z)\quad;\quad \mathrm{Im}\,y_t^j=\mathrm{Im}\,y.\end{aligned}$$

In particular, we see that if $x, y \in B_t(s,z)$, then $x_t^j, y_t^j \in B_j(t,z)$, and moreover $x_j^j = x$, $y_j^j = y$. Therefore, we can consider the contour $\Gamma_t(s,z)$ given by,

$$\Gamma_t(s,z)\,:\,\zeta = F_t(s,z,x,y)\,;\,\eta = G_t(s,z,x,y)\,;\,x,y\in B_t(s,z),$$

where F_t and G_t are defined by,

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Re } F_t(s,z,x,y) &= (1-t)\text{Re } F_0(s,z,x_t^0,y_t^0) + t\text{Re } F_1(s,z,x_t^1,y_t^1);\\
\text{Im } F_t(s,z,x,y) &= (1-t)\langle s\rangle\rho_t(s)\text{Im } F_0(s,z,x_t^0,y_t^0) + t\text{Im } F_1(s,z,x_t^1,y_t^1);\\
\text{Re } G_t(s,z,x,y) &= (1-t)\text{Re } G_0(s,z,x_t^0,y_t^0) + t\text{Re } G_1(s,z,x_t^1,y_t^1);\\
\text{Im } G_t(s,z,x,y) &= (1-t)\langle s\rangle\rho_t(s)\text{Im } G_0(s,z,x_t^0,y_t^0) + t\text{Im } G_1(s,z,x_t^1,y_t^1).
\end{aligned}$$

(Note that the notations remain consistent when $t = 0$ or $t = 1$.) Then, $t \mapsto \Gamma_t(s,z)$ is a continuous deformation between $\Gamma_0(s,z)$ and $\Gamma_1(s,z)$, and, along $\Gamma_t(s,z)$, a straightforward computation gives,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{Im }((y-x)\eta + (z-y)\zeta)\\
&\qquad = (1-t)\text{Im }((y_t^0 - x_t^0)G_0(x_t^0,y_t^0) + (z-y_t^0)F_0(x_t^0,y_t^0))\\
&\qquad\quad + t\text{Im }((y_t^1 - x_t^1)G_1(x_t^1,y_t^1) + (z-y_t^1)F_1(x_t^1,y_t^1)),
\end{aligned}$$

and thus, using (A.5) and (A.6), and the fact that $\Phi_0(x) = \Phi_0(x_t^0) = \Phi_0(x_t^1)$, we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Phi_0(x) - \Phi_0(z) - \text{Im }((y-x)\eta + (z-y)\zeta)\\
&\qquad \le -\delta_1(1-t)\rho_t^2(s)\big[|\text{Re }(z-y)|^2 + |\text{Re }(z-x)|^2\big]\\
&\qquad\qquad -\delta_1(1-t)\big[|\text{Im }(z-y)|^2 + |\text{Im }(z-x)|^2\big]\\
&\qquad\quad -\delta_2 t\rho_t^2(s)\big[|\text{Re }(z-y)|^2 + |\text{Re }(z-x)|^2\big]\\
&\qquad\qquad -\delta_2 t\big[|\text{Im }(z-y)|^2 + |\text{Im }(z-x)|^2\big].
\end{aligned}$$

In particular, setting $\delta = \min(\delta_1, \delta_2)$, this gives,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Phi_0(x) - \Phi_0(z) - \text{Im }((y-x)\eta + (z-y)\zeta)\\
&\qquad \le -\delta\rho_t^2(s)\big[|\text{Re }(z-y)|^2 + |\text{Re }(z-x)|^2\big]\\
&\qquad\qquad -\delta\big[|\text{Im }(z-y)|^2 + |\text{Im }(z-x)|^2\big],
\end{aligned}$$

and we also obtain that $\Phi_0(x) - \Phi_0(z) - \text{Im }((y-x)\eta + (z-y)\zeta) \le -\delta r_0^2$ on the boundary of $\Gamma_t(s,z)$. As a consequence, $\Gamma_t(s,z)$ is a good contour for the phase $\Phi_0(x) - \text{Im }((y-x)\eta + (z-y)\zeta)$ uniformly with respect to s, and it remains to prove that, if r_0 has been chosen small enough, and if $z \in \Omega_s(z_+(x_0,\xi_0),\varepsilon)$ with $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, then, for all $t \in [0,1]$, along $\Gamma_t(s,z)$ one has $y + \widetilde{W_1}(s,\zeta,\eta) \in \Sigma_\nu$.

We first observe that, by definition, the functions F_j and G_j $(j = 0, 1)$ verify,

$$|\text{Re } F_j + \text{Im } z| + |\text{Re } G_j + \text{Im } z| \leq C\rho_j(s)\big[|\text{Re } (z-y)| + |\text{Re } (z-x)|\big] \\ +|\text{Im } (z-y)| + |\text{Im } (z-x)|,$$

for some uniform constant $C > 0$. Then, for any $t \in [0, 1]$, we deduce,

$$|\text{Re } F_t + \text{Im } z| + |\text{Re } G_t + \text{Im } z| \leq C\rho_t(s)\big[|\text{Re } (z-y)| + |\text{Re } (z-x)|\big] \\ +C\big[|\text{Im } (z-y)| + |\text{Im } (z-x)|\big],$$

and thus, on $\Gamma_t(s, z)$,

$$|\text{Re } \zeta + \text{Im } z| + |\text{Re } \eta + \text{Im } z| \leq 4Cr_0.$$

Similarly, we find,

$$|\text{Im } F_t| + |\text{Im } G_t| \leq C((1-t)\rho_t(s) + t)\rho_t(s)\big[|\text{Re } (z-y)| + |\text{Re } (z-x)|\big] \\ +C((1-t)\rho_t(s) + t)\big[|\text{Im } (z-y)| + |\text{Im } (z-x)|\big],$$

and thus, on $\Gamma_t(s, z)$,

$$|\text{Im } \zeta| + |\text{Im } \eta| \leq 4Cr_0.$$

Therefore, using (A.3)-(A.4), we deduce that, along $\Gamma_t(s, z)$, we have,

$$y + \widetilde{W_1}(s, \zeta, \eta) = z + \partial_\zeta \widetilde{W}(s, -\text{Im } z) + Y,$$

where $z, Y \in \mathbb{C}^n$ verifies,

$$|Y| \leq C_1 r_0 \langle s \rangle, \quad |z - z_+(x_0, \xi_0)| \leq C_1 \varepsilon \langle s \rangle,$$

with a constant $C_1 > 0$ independent of r_0, ε. In particular, using (4.4) and Lemma 3.1, we conclude that $y + \widetilde{W_1}(s, \zeta, \eta) \in \Sigma_\nu$ as long as r_0 and ε are taken sufficiently small. □

B Derivatives on non-local H_{Φ_0}-spaces

With Op_R defined as in (3.3) and $Z(s)$ as in Proposition 5.1, we have,

Lemma B.1. *For all $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n$, $\varepsilon > 0$, and $R \geq 1$ large enough, there exists $C > 0$, such that,*

$$\|(hD_z)^\alpha v - \text{Op}_R(\zeta^\alpha)v\|_{L^2_{\Phi_0}(\Omega_s(Z(s),\varepsilon))} \leq C\langle s \rangle^n e^{-1/Ch} \|v\|_{L^2_{\Phi_0}(\Omega_s(Z(s),\varepsilon + 4R^{-1/2}))},$$

uniformly with respect to $s \geq 0$, $v \in H_{\Phi_0}(\Omega_s(Z(s), \varepsilon_1))$, and $h > 0$ small enough.

Proof. When $\alpha = 0$, if we parametrize $\gamma_R(z)$ by $y \in \mathbb{C}^n$, we find,

$$\mathrm{Op}_R(1)v(z;h) = \left(\frac{R}{\pi h}\right)^n \int_{|y-z|<R^{-1/2}} e^{-R|y-z|^2/h} w_z(y) d\mathrm{Re}\, y\, d\mathrm{Im}\, y,$$

with

$$w_z(y) := e^{-i(z-y)\mathrm{Im}\ z/h} v(y). \tag{B.1}$$

Setting

$$x := R^{1/2} \left(\mathrm{Re}\ (y-z), \mathrm{Im}\ (y-z)\right),$$

and $\lambda := 2/h$, the previous integral becomes,

$$(\pi h)^{-n} \int_B e^{-\lambda x^2/2} \tilde{w}_z(x) dx,$$

with $B := \{x := (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}\,;\, |x| < 1\}$, and

$$\tilde{w}_z(x) := w_z(z + R^{-1/2}(x_1 + ix_2)).$$

Then, we can apply the analytic stationary phase theorem, as stated in [Sj] Theorem 2.1, and, observing that $\Delta \tilde{w}_z(x) \equiv 0$, we obtain,

$$\mathrm{Op}_R(1)v(z;h) = v(z;h) + R_N(h),$$

where, for all $N \geq 1$ and $h > 0$, $R_N(h)$ verifies,

$$|R_N(h)| \leq C_n 2^{-n} h^{n+N} (N+1)^n N! \sup_{\tilde{x} \in \widetilde{B}} |\tilde{w}_z(\tilde{x})|,$$

for some constant $C_n > 0$, and with $\widetilde{B} := \{\tilde{x} = \mu x\,;\, x \in B\,,\, \mu \in \mathbb{C}\,,\, |\mu| < 1\} \subset \{\tilde{x} = (\tilde{x}_1, \tilde{x}_2) \in \mathbb{C}^{2n}\,;\, |\tilde{x}_1 + i\tilde{x}_2| < 2\}$. Then, taking $N = [1/C_1 h]$ with $C_1 > 1$, we easily deduce,

$$|\mathrm{Op}_R(1)v(z;h) - v(z;h)| \leq C e^{-1/Ch} \sup_{\tilde{x} \in \widetilde{B}} |\tilde{w}_z(\tilde{x})|, \tag{B.2}$$

for some constant $C > 0$ independent of R. Now, by Cauchy estimates, for any $\tilde{x} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ with $|\tilde{x}| < 2$, we see that (for some other constant $C > 0$ independent of R),

$$|v(z + R^{-1/2}\tilde{x})| \leq C R^{n/4} e^{(CR^{-1/2} + \Phi_0(z + R^{-1/2}\tilde{x}))/h} \|v\|_{L^2_{\Phi_0}(B_z(4R^{-1/2}))}, \tag{B.3}$$

where $B_z(4R^{-1/2}) := \{z' \in \mathbb{C}^n\,;\, |z' - z| < 4R^{-1/2}\}$. On the other hand, we have,

$$|-\Phi_0(z) + iR^{-1/2}\tilde{x}\,\mathrm{Im}\ z + \Phi_0(z + R^{-1/2}\tilde{x})| = R^{-1}(\mathrm{Im}\ \tilde{x})^2 \leq 4R^{-1}. \tag{B.4}$$

We deduce from (B.1)-(B.4),

$$|\mathrm{Op}_R(1)v(z;h) - v(z;h)| \leq CR^{n/4}e^{\Phi_0(z)/h+CR^{-1/2}-1/Ch}\|v\|_{L^2_{\Phi_0}(B_z(4R^{-1/2}))},$$

for some (new) constant $C > 0$ independent of R. Therefore, taking R sufficiently large, for all z in $\Omega_s(Z(s), \varepsilon)$, we obtain,

$$e^{-\Phi_0(z)/h}|\mathrm{Op}_R(1)v(z;h) - v(z;h)| \leq CR^{n/4}e^{-1/2Ch}\|v\|_{L^2_{\Phi_0}(\Omega_s(\varepsilon+4R^{-1/2}))}.$$

Taking the square and integrating with respect to z on $\Omega_s(Z(s), \varepsilon)$, the result for $\alpha = 0$ follows. Then, the general result for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n$ follows, too, by observing that $\mathrm{Op}_R(\zeta^\alpha)v = (hD_z)^\alpha \mathrm{Op}_R(1)v + \mathcal{O}(e^{-1/2h}\sup_{|y-z|\leq R^{-1/2}}|v(y)|$.
$\square$

References

[Do1] Doi, S., *Smoothing effects for Schrödinger evolution equation and global behavior of geodesic flow*, Math. Ann. **318** (2000), 355–389.

[Do2] Doi, S., *Singularities of solutions of Schrödinger equations for perturbed harmonic oscillators*, Hyperbolic problems and related topics, Grad. Ser. Anal. 185–199, Int. Press, Somerville, MA, 2003.

[HaWu] Hassel, A., Wunsch, J., *The Schrödinger propagator for scattering metrics*, Annals of Mathematics, 162 (2005)

[Ho] Hörmander, L.: The Analysis of Linear Partial Differential Operators, Vol III, Springer Verlag, 1983–1985.

[It] Ito, K.: *Propagation of Singularities for Schrödinger Equations on the Euclidean Space with a Scattering Metric*, Comm. P. D. E., **31** (12), 1735–1777 (2006).

[KaTa] Kajitani, K., Tagliatela, G., *Microlocal smoothing effect for Schrödinger equations in Gevrey spaces*, J. Math. Soc. Japan 55 (2003), 855-896

[Ma1] Martinez, A., *Estimates on complex interactions in phase Space*, Math. Nachr. **167** (1994), 203–254.

[Ma2] Martinez, A., An Introduction to Semiclassical and Microlocal Analysis, UTX Series, Springer-Verlag New-York, 2002.

[MNS1] Martinez, A., Nakamura, S., Sordoni, V., *Analytic smoothing effect for the Schrödinger equation with long-range perturbation*, Comm. Pure App. Math. **LIX** (2006), 1330–1351.

[MNS2] Martinez, A., Nakamura, S., Sordoni, V., *Analytic Wave Front Set for Solutions to Schrödinger Equations*, Preprint 2007

[MRZ] Morimoto, Y., Robbiano, L., Zuily, C., *Remark on the smoothing for the Schrödinger equation*, Indiana University Mathematic Journal **49** (2000), 1563–1579.

[Na1] Nakamura, S., *Propagation of the Homogeneous Wave Front Set for Schrödinger Equations*, Duke Math. J. **126**, 349-367 (2005).

[Na2] Nakamura, S., *Wave front set for solutions to Schrödinger equations*, Preprint 2004, to appear in J. Functional Analysis.

[Na3] Nakamura, S., *Semiclassical singularities propagation properties for the Schrödinger equations*, Preprint 2006, to appear in J. Math. Soc. Japan.

[ReSi] Reed, M., Simon, B., *The Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics*, Vol. I-IV, Academic Press, 1972-1980.

[Ro] Robert, D., *Autour de l'Approximation Semi-Classique*, Birkhäuser (1987).

[RoZu1] Robbiano, L., Zuily, C., *Microlocal analytic smoothing effect for Schrödinger equation*, Duke Math. J. **100** (1999), 93–129.

[RoZu2] Robbiano, L., Zuily, C., *Effet régularisant microlocal analytique pour l'équation de Schrödinger: le cas des données oscillantes*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **100** (2000) 1891–1906.

[RoZu3] Robbiano, L., Zuily, C., *Analytic theory for the quadratic scattering wave front set and application to the Schrödinger equation*, Soc. Math. France, Astérisque **283** (2002), 1–128.

[Sj] Sjöstrand, J., *Singularités analytiques microlocales*, Soc. Math. France, Astérisque **95** (1982), 1–166.

[Wu] Wunsch, J., *Propagation of singularities and growth for Schrödinger operators*, Duke Math. J. **98** (1999), 137-186.